AUM

Point out the "Way"—however dimly,
and lost among the host—as does the evening
star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—*The Voice of the Silence*

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. X MARCH 1939 No. 3

PHILOSOPHY FOR TO-MORROW

"In the heart of to-day is the word of to-morrow."

To a detached onlooker the Continent of Europe presents the picture of a will-less person, who yet is stubborn; he is incapable of reasoning; he has no time to enquire, in the midst of impulsive talk and deeds, if there are perchance people who have thought and have found a remedy for the ills of the world. Whatever cerebration takes place is ensouled by feelings—by anger, by the spirit of retaliation, by distrust and above all by ghastly fear. In the midst of the uproar and the din, how many perceive that the politician has failed and is no more in a position to avert the doom which his own action has been precipitating? Germany is doomed; Hitler cannot save it and so neither can Italy be saved by Mussolini or Russia by Stalin. The British politician, be he conservative or be he radical, is as helpless as his French confrère. The storm is fast approaching, it will break very soon, and no political party can avert it. It looks too late to hope that the storm enveloping Europe will pass away without injuring her even unto death. The pressing problem now, as several clear-minded thinkers have pointed out, is not how to avert the catastrophe and to repair the damage already done, but what plans to evolve against the time when the storm will be over and the wreck will be left behind. Present-day philosophies by which states are governed have to be abandoned—government by parties in countries which are called democratic or by cliques of dictators which enslave whole nations under the name of Socialism. The foreign policies of all countries, sustained by secret diplomatic negotiations, are founded upon a false principle—the safeguarding and the enhancing of narrow nationalism. The hands of not

a single Occidental nation are clean, and no one can help seeing the truth underlying the audacity of Hitler who has recently, on more than one occasion, pointed to the past misdemeanours of Britain, the U.S.A. and other countries. Japan, copying the Occidental methods, has already soiled her hands with blood and has forfeited her right to participate in the task of amelioration which the rest of Asia can undertake, utilizing the ancient philosophies of Buddha and Shankara, of Lao-tzu and Confucius and of other giant minds of the past. One phase of that work of amelioration has already begun—the altruistic labours of India's present-day great leader—M. K. Gandhiji.

After the storm—what ?

Not politicians but philosophers should undertake the task of deciding ; politicians have proved impractical and have failed and there is a dearth of practical philosophers in the West. There the function of philosophy has been compartmentalized ; its task mainly has been to speculate. Even when it has attempted to apply its principles to practical affairs it has gone about it in an incorrect way, falling prey to the besetting sin of modern civilization—the division of life into sacred and secular. Life one and indivisible has been divided—religion for Sundays and business for the rest of the week. Political principles of conduct accepted as correct, if made applicable to personal conduct would deprive a man of every vestige of self-respect, *e.g.*, a man truthful and punctilious about his word at his own club thinks nothing of telling a lie and calling it diplomacy when he is in a foreign office. Society morals also depict the same feature—church-going people indulge in secret immoralities of thought, semi-secret immoralities in words and open immoralities in deeds. We could multiply examples.

Religion, philosophy and science compartmentalized have divided corporate life, and the individual finds himself psychologically in a disintegrated condition. The fundamental principle of the great plan of construction after the storm is over will be to produce integrated men making up an integrated society. The practical mystics and the philosophers, whose minds are agonized by the suffering on every side but whose hearts are seeking the means of redemption, will be the "builders of joy", but they will have to abandon old modes of thought and to accept a new philosophy of life. In the article which follows, Professor Malkani points out the error of Western philosophers :

> It is a wrong way to proceed to solve the problems of reason from within reason. They can only be solved when reason is confronted with a new perception of reality.

This new perception is not really new—it was the perception of Plato and of his master Pythagoras, who belonged to the same great era in which Lao-tzu and Confucius, Zarathustra and Vardhamana all were catching and reflecting the Light of Divine Wisdom ; its most powerful current streamed forth from the ideation and preachment of the great Buddha. The West

needs the teachings of that old Wisdom-Religion ; not a few individuals have already been influenced by its doctrines, but what is needed to-day is their application in society and state, to the lives of masses of men.

In this issue we revert to the political philosophy of Gandhiji's *Hind Swaraj* to which our issue of last September was devoted. In that issue we gave mainly British views ; herein are three contributions from the U.S.A. which without meaning to do so bring out the point we have made above that life has become compartmentalized in the Occident. The order of sequence adopted in this issue has a purpose. In India also that habit of separating the secular from the sacred has come to prevail, as some of our Indian contributions reveal. Every writer, Occidental or Oriental, however, admits the nobility and the truth of Gandhiji's philosophy for the individual, its efficacy for the redemption of the Soul, but many, and among them numerous Indians, hesitate to accept its implications to the full in the fashioning of our national future. The last article from the pen of Mr. Manu Subedar makes a valuable contribution ; he has thought through the problem and accepts the validity of the religion of Satyagraha very fully.

We revert to this subject because it is of prime and pressing importance to the world at large. It is through a careful study and an impartial examination of the doctrines of *Hind Swaraj* that true philosophical principles will be perceived and ways and means will be found to reconstruct a shattered world wherein peace and good will can prevail.

PHILOSOPHY AND LIFE

[**Professor G. R. Malkani** is the Head of the Indian Institute of Philosophy at Amalner and is the Managing Editor of *The Philosophical Quarterly,* the official organ of the Indian Philosophical Congress.—EDS.]

Philosophy may be defined as the self-conscious attempt to solve certain ultimate questions relating to the nature of reality and our place in it. Is there any vital relation between life and philosophy understood in this sense ?

Western thinkers generally do not stress the connection between life and philosophy. There is no conception of a philosophical life. The philosopher is supposed to be an ordinary man devoted to the solution of certain special problems. There is nothing special about the kind of life he leads. Philosophy merely happens to be his particular occupation. There are certain problems which he tries to solve as there are certain other problems which the scientist or any student of human affairs tries to solve. Philosophy does not mean to him a certain type of life.

This view will not find general acceptance in India. The traditional

Indian view is that he is not a philosopher who merely seeks to solve intellectually certain ultimate problems or who can discourse learnedly upon them. Philosophy is not for intellectual adornment. It is essentially a way of life. Philosophy is not one thing and life another. Philosophy is life itself and, as a matter of fact, the highest kind of life.

This difference of opinion as to the relation of philosophy to life is to be traced to the conception of philosophy itself. Philosophy in the West follows the lead of the sciences. It is purely an intellectual affair. What the philosopher desires is a certain intellectual scheme into which all the facts of experience may be fitted and through which they may be explained. It must accordingly be a very comprehensive scheme. The facts of experience are infinitely complex; the intellectual scheme which will explain them must be correspondingly complicated. The only means at our disposal to get at any such scheme, according to Western philosophy, is imaginative construction. This is just how the scientist goes to work. There is no difference at all in method, but only in the scope of the subject. It is admitted that we can never arrive at a complete scheme. That is an ideal only. Philosophy is bound by its very nature to be infinitely progressive.

It follows from this view that no philosophical problem can ever be finally solved. Philosophical problems hang together. We may attack them singly, but they cannot be solved singly. If we solve one, we must solve all the rest. There is an organic relation between them. One problem arises from another and hangs by it. If then we cannot solve all the problems of philosophy, we cannot solve a single one of them. It is different in science. There, the facts automatically fall in certain well-defined groups. Each group can now be isolated and tackled by itself. Indeed, there is no hard and fast line between the different groups of facts which constitute the different departments of science. But the question of their further connection can be postponed. In philosophy, this piecemeal treatment of problems is not possible. There is no demarcation between its facts, for all the facts of experience taken together have to be synthesised in a comprehensive view.

But if no solutions are achieved, what is achieved? It is contended in the West that the value of philosophy does not consist in the conclusions arrived at, but in the spirit of dispassionate reasoning in which they are reached. It is not *a philosophy* that we want so much as the *spirit* of one or what may be called *philosophising*. This alone has value. We must seek to reason and to get a reasoned view of things. In this way, we shall acquire a certain caution and balance in life, a certain acuteness of conception and a certain ability to take a synthetic or a whole view of things. The value of philosophy is negative. It does not necessarily give us *the truth*. But it frees us from dogmatism and from short and ill-considered views. It is a necessary part of a truly liberal education. The philosopher does not definitely solve any particular problem and he does not see reality differently from others. He sees just

the same reality. Only he has questions and doubts and is conscious of being ignorant where the ordinary man is not.

Philosophy thus understood can hardly be expected to give a new direction to life or to bring about a change in the ideals of life. In India, philosophy is not so understood. It is not understood to be an intellectual or an imaginative affair. The philosopher does not seek an imaginative scheme of concepts. That can have no truth-value. He seeks a new perception of reality or a direct knowledge of the underlying unity of all things. Philosophy is called *tattvagyān* or knowledge of the essential substance. We cannot indeed dispense with reasoning. But we must reason in order to *see better*. Reason is an instrument only. It is a means to an end. This end is the Absolute Truth. It is beyond reason, but reason can point the way to it. *It is a wrong way to proceed to solve the problems of reason from within reason. They can only be solved when reason is confronted with a new perception of reality.* Mere subtlety of thought is no mark of truth. Systems wide apart can be equally subtle. But then webs of fancy can be subtle too. What really matters in philosophy is the subtlety of perception or a finer sense of truth and of value.

The underlying unity of all things is not conceived in an abstract way. It is not some essence or substance far away from us and external to us. It is our very self. The philosophical undertaking thus becomes an undertaking to know the self ; it becomes what is called *adhyātmic vidya*. The self can certainly be known. It is not some mysterious stuff hidden away from us. It is of all realities the most immediate and the nearest to us. It illumines the whole world for us. Can it itself remain in darkness ? It is the light that lighteth everything. For it is *the principle* of intelligence. To know this self in its full significance, to recognise it as the basis of the world, is to solve the metaphysical riddle. A true philosopher is one who has realized in himself the solution of the riddle. He is not one who is groping in the dark, not knowing his way.

Philosophy understood in this way cannot but have a vital relation to life. It is its own justification. There is nothing higher than perception of the ultimate truth. This perception is life itself and the highest kind of life. We must not judge it by external standards merely. These are at best secondary. The real test is inner. If a man has doubts still lurking in him, he has not perceived the truth. The only sure sign of this perception is that all doubts and all questions have been dissolved and the inner life has become free. There is a sense of unbounded freedom and of joy. No one can deceive himself. Perception of the truth cannot but lead to inner satisfaction and inner peace. The *burden* of existence has disappeared. We are on a permanent holiday. Such is the result of the realisation of philosophic truth. True philosophy in India is not separated from life. It is the very best of life and the best of religion.

G. R. MALKANI

A TRIAD FROM THE UNITED STATES

[Below we print three articles on Gandhiji's book *Hind Swaraj* which examine the value and the applicability of its doctrines to the present-day conditions in the United States of America. All of them accept the religious message of the book while presenting the difficulties of their application to socio-economic problems.—EDS.]

THE UNIVERSAL AND THE PARTICULAR

[**James Truslow Adams** examines the major problems of our civilization by the principal Western method which separates religion from politics and economics. Life is one and indivisible and a man's religion affects his political behaviour and his conduct as employer or employee, as investor and earner. Recognizing that since the Great War the West has "suffered from an almost complete breakdown in morality", he acknowledges the worth of Gandhiji's religious teaching with its power to bring a spiritual regeneration and he would like his countrymen to take those religious ideas to heart and to use them. If that is done and if a spiritual regeneration takes place there will naturally follow a complete change in the sphere of economics and politics.—EDS.]

I have read both Gandhi's book and the articles commenting on it in the September issue of THE ARYAN PATH with intense interest, and, I think, with a certain philosophic detachment. I am not a citizen of the British Empire, and I believe that the author is not playing a "deep game" but is wholly sincere. So the ground is cleared for an unprejudiced judgment save for one point which may offer insuperable difficulty. I belong to the Western world; Gandhi to the Eastern; and the book has made me realize the complete difference as I never did before. Yet it is not utterly complete.

With my approach to Gandhi's teachings, free or limited as noted above, they seem to divide themselves into two distinct segments of varying importance, or at least of varying possibility of acceptance by a Westerner. There is the religious teacher, and the politico-economic reformer. With the first I am in almost complete accord, but the second is somewhat incomprehensible to one struggling with the problems and mistakes of Occidental civilization. Perhaps it may be better to discuss these in reverse order, for I think that the first is of universal application whereas the second is of limited, if any.

I say, if any, because I have never been in the Orient and do not know India at first hand. Whether large parts of India are still at an economic-social stage which would fit Gandhi's philosophy or could return to such a stage I do not know. It is a common illusion of the race to think of a golden age in the past. Perhaps India, in the rural sections, is in it or close to it, but the question which at once strikes a Westerner is: How far back would you go, and *can* you go? There are certain schools of thinkers in the West who, seeing the ills and maladjustments of our present stage, would have us try to

go back to some earlier one, such as the guild organization of the Middle Ages. But the two questions I have asked remain : how far back to go and can we go ? Gandhi would evidently have us go very far indeed but not all the way. He rightly says that he should not be judged by extracts, and that he is not at present bent on destroying all machinery and hospitals and doctors, but all of this part of his teaching is evidently an integral part of his philosophy as a reformer, and he seems to think that Swaraj cannot be attained for all until we have retreated to a pre-machine age.

Machines and the machine age grow ever more complex but what, after all, is the significance of machinery and applied science ? Is it not merely the human mind exerting control over the forces of nature ? Looked at thus, the simplest stone axe, the discovery of fire, the lever and the wheel were perhaps greater advances toward a machine age than the most complex steamship, railway system or newspaper plant of to-day. Gandhiji's own spinning-wheel is a machine. It simplifies and reduces human labour and makes a new product possible. Where, then, would he have us go back to ? He seems to have in mind the economy of an Indian village at a certain stage, but that cannot be universal, even if possible yet in India. It could not be done in the West without such a vast sacrifice of population as would make any flood or famine of the past seem like the peaceful death of an individual.

There is a limit to the number of people who can support themselves by agriculture on a given area. That was the fundamental thesis of Malthus, which was only disproved by the increase who could live by the machine and by improved methods of agriculture given by science and machines. For example, in the United States we had a population a century ago of about 13,000,000. We now have 130,000,000. In 1838 about 90% of the people lived on the land as farmers. Now only about 25%. The increase of some 87,000,000 not living on the land, are able to make a living because of the machine and the complex of services which it has created. What would become of them if we went back to the simple economy of the farm of a century ago ? They would not only be wiped out with intense suffering but there would be wild social revolution. Whatever might happen in India, we in the West have advanced too far to retreat.

Nor do the people themselves want to retreat. Gandhi speaks of men formerly working in the open air and only as much as they liked. He is thinking of a tropical climate, and I do not think it true, in America, at least, that workers in factories are worse off than beasts. If you visit an up-to-date factory you will find it built largely of glass, flooded with sunshine, air-conditioned, and with work hours limited by law or agreement. Outside will be the workmen's motor cars waiting to take them home and then their families for a drive. In their homes you will find electric light, a radio, perhaps an oil burner furnace, and other comforts which a king could not have had two centuries ago. This is not to be found

everywhere, and having solved the problem of producing plenty we still have to find the answer to how to distribute the social product more equitably, but the worker is himself aware of the new rôle of the Machine. A century ago the worker was destroying the machines which he believed were ruining his life. A few years ago, the American Federation of Labour passed the following Resolution :

"Whereas, the increased productivity of industry resulting from scientific research is a most potent factor in the ever-increasing struggle of the workers to raise their standard of living, and the importance of this factor must steadily increase since there is a limit beyond which the average standard cannot progress by the usual methods of readjustment, which limit can only be raised by research and the utilisation of research in industry", they asked the government to aid in a broad programme of research.

It is true that the machine has done much harm but it has also done much good. The Westerner views it much as Gandhi does education, as "merely an instrument and an instrument may be well used or abused". Radio, for example, may spread hatred between nations or carry vulgarity on the ether, but it may also bring understanding, the best of music and other cultural influences into the poorest homes, and serve humanity in a score of ways, as in shipwrecks at sea.

Again, perhaps Gandhi overemphasizes the influence of the press. When one of the greatest newspaper owners in America, with a chain of papers from coast to coast, ran for Congress he was heavily defeated in spite of his newspaper chorus. In 1936 most of the press of America was against Roosevelt for President and he won by an unprecedented majority. Once more, Gandhi's opposition to doctors and hospitals strikes the Westerner as inconceivable, and makes the gulf seem wide indeed between East and West. How can a doctor tell his patients "the cause of their diseases" without scientific knowledge, and, if he can, what good can he do if he cannot help to cure? Some years ago I got a blister on my foot which broke, and the deadly streptococci germs entered my system. For five weeks my life hung in the balance. The surgeons, because of their scientific knowledge and with instruments made by machines, injected other germs which ate up the streptococci. My body was a battle-field, but the victory was won. Again, my face was badly burned and my eyesight saved only by a new scientific invention. Gandhi's statement that if the patient is not saved the doctor may have been merciful to him, and the world will not come to grief, again expresses the difference between the passivity and fatalism of the East and the energy, egoistic if you will, of the West. We want all the medical knowledge we can get to enable us to lead healthy, happy and useful lives.

The streptococci example leads us to the question of non-resistance. Gandhi seems to be willing to use some controls over nature, such as fire and the simpler machines. Should I have used control to resist the streptococci or not? It raises once more the question of what point we are to stop at. It would take us too far in this brief article to discuss the

fundamental organization of the universe, but there seem to be two powers at work, one making for good and the other for evil. Many religions have dramatized these contending forces, if they are such. The Westerner admits the presence of an evil tendency but is inclined to believe that in doing the best he can to lift the world to a higher plane, to leave it, in however slight degree, better than he found it, he is aligning himself with whatever power for good, call it God, there is; and that he is not merely passive but using all his strength for that end. Gandhi, in his religious teaching, of which I shall speak in a moment, allies himself with the greatest teachers of all ages and lands. Yet Christ, the "Prince of Peace" and the founder of most Western religion, who was largely a pacifist and non-resistant, said "I come to bring not peace but a sword", and when good words would not drive the money-changers from the Temple, he scourged them out. The West inherits that combined doctrine.

It is not in its nature to be wholly non-resistant. Gandhi says that such ephemeral civilizations as ours have often come and gone. Ours may go, but it is different from all earlier ones, for better or worse, and there is an irresistible urge in us to make it better. In many ways it has become so in the last century, though not in others. Perhaps what we have done would not appeal to the East but we have not been oblivious to our faults and have tried to reform them. That story would make an article in itself. The point is that we feel the urge to change and improvement. At present we, in the democratic countries, feel toward the dictators,—so called, but who are really types of the earliest forms of government, despots, and not due to the machine age,—much as my surgeon did toward the streptococci germs who were threatening my life. We feel that they represent not a development of our civilization but a reintroduction into it of barbarism and an earlier type of life.

I have, perhaps, taken too much space for disagreements with Gandhi and have not enough left to express my admiration and complete accord with his more universal teaching, of which the world was never more in need than at present. His doctrines of self-control, of love, and of "soul force" need to be woven into the warp and woof of Western no less than Eastern life. I have humbly preached the same doctrines, and believe that no civilization, Western or other, can be saved without a fundamental change in orientation such as that of Gandhi. Especially since the Great War we have suffered from an almost complete breakdown in morality. Private contracts, international treaties, the words of great statesmen, can no longer be counted upon. Civilization of any sort cannot live on lies and broken promises.

The last war was the greatest ever known. The machinery of the world was also the most delicate. The resultant catastrophe has been colossal. This does not mean, to those of us who are still hopeful of salvaging the best in the new civilization and slowly correcting its evils, that we cannot pick up and start again. But I do not think we can unless there is a

regeneration of the spirit. In the practical politics of the moment, the points to which I object in Gandhi's philosophy may be the more important to India, but for us in the West it is his spiritual, and not his economic-social teachings, which are of prime and great import. Aloof as we are here in America from the British Empire and the " problem of India ", these teachings can be taken to heart, and help us to that spiritual regeneration which I believe essential to the maintenance and advancement of Western civilization.

A social or economic development cannot, in my opinion, be held at a given point chosen by one individual, but the verities of religion and of ethics are eternal. For that reason, however, they are not linked to or dependent on any particular stage of economic development. In the recent disaster which overwhelmed the section of America in which I live —the hurricane in New England— men and women performed heroic feats to help their fellows, and that they used in doing so all the means which the machine and science provide instead of merely their hands and feet made no difference. These were merely material. The urge and the spirit of willing sacrifice were spiritual. What we Westerners envisage is a better use of our increasing power over the forces of nature so as to secure the material benefits for an ever enlarging circle of people without losing the spiritual advance which has been made. It may be a mad dream but it is one for which we are still willing to risk all. We in America are deeply conscious of the faults of the present but we prefer to try to correct them and go forward rather than backward to some earlier stage of development. In fact we *could* not if we *would*. The change and loss of life would be too appalling. Here and there an individual might accept Gandhiji's return to his particular ideal of economic and scientific development, but the nation of 130,000,000 would not do so. Even if only non-resistance were employed, and if it were successful, it would nevertheless be the greatest mass murder of population in history. On the other hand, if we cannot turn again to the religious teachings of the great leaders including Gandhi, our material advance will avail us nought and may prove only the instrument of self-destruction.

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

NON-VIOLENCE NOT FOR THE WEST

[**Estelle H. Ries** raises the difficulty of the impracticability of non-violence in a world in which four-fifths of humanity is given over to violence.—EDS.]

Should the principles of truth and non-violence as set forth by Gandhi be accepted or rejected in America ? I am far from certain that they should be accepted even in India. From only a superficial survey of developments in India since British occupation, it would seem that non-violence is the very seat of India's original, continued and increasing

troubles. While India is turning the other cheek, England calmly dismembers the entire body. Unless miracles still happen, the time factor will have served to annihilate this great ancient land. It has been said that Gandhi has both persuaded conservatives that change must come, and has persuaded radicals that change must be gradual to be permanent. Yet to the distant Westerner, it seems that Western means of speed and strength are needed to cope with the speed and strength of India's Western antagonist. In any duel the combatants are equally equipped. A battle of wits or of morale cannot be successful against actual physical violence which destroys the body that is the channel for spiritual expression.

As we look out upon the world to-day, it can be questioned whether this is a moral universe and whether those individuals triumph who base their cause upon morality. Much as we would like to believe this, all the evidence negates it. It may be true "in the long run" speaking in time measured geologically or astronomically, or in terms of future incarnations, but where will frail man be then, be he ever so moral? The typical Hindu differs widely from the typical white man for the former thinks in terms of spiritual values while the latter thinks in terms of earthly profit and loss.

Gandhi would like to see India like Samuel Butler's Erewhon where all machines were illegal. The Occidental world has developed an industrial civilization during a century of stupendous technological advancement. The scientifically-minded West finds Gandhiji's opposition to this too inconceivable to refute, for science has the advantage of being able to prove its progress while things of the intangible spirit lack this ability. To America it is as much a religion to solve earth's mysteries on the physical and chemical sides, as it is to India to promote knowledge of the unexplained laws of metaphysical realms. In the consideration of technology the trouble is not with the efficiency of the physical sciences but with the deplorable inefficiency and backwardness of the social sciences. India neglects the one, the Occident neglects the other. Each is unbalanced on one side of its development, whereas both could make for full human welfare by strengthening the missing factors.

In Gandhi's chapter on civilization, he treats its faults and follies, but says nothing of the advantages which have so attracted four-fifths of the world. These faults and follies are subject to removal as individuals and groups acquire wisdom and learn to motivate their lives in all spheres —physical, emotional, mental, economic, social and spiritual. It is entirely possible to acquire wisdom by means of increased health via more scientific nourishment and doctors; broader education via travel and railroads, and all those activities through which individuals learn and advance themselves. There is no reason why such a civilization should not be conducted along moral lines. Regrettably, in many, many ways, that is the last consideration. Here is where people of Gandhi's tremendous power and influence might help

to bestir the sleeping ethics of the tragic four-fifths. Both types of civilization have much to offer each other ; both now are lopsided for lack of what the other could give it.

Gandhi's kind of civilization may be in many ways better than the Western type, but with four-fifths of the world practising a different kind, how can a basis of contact and understanding be established ? I would rather start with the kind now everywhere in progress, and try to build from there—build up the humanities in a machine age, learn to use the machines unselfishly for the interest of the greatest numbers. In this connection the article, "Revolution by Electricity" in *Scribner's Magazine* for October, 1934, concerning itself with social effects of the Tennessee valley project, holds a solution of interest and use to India, as does also "Chemistry Wrecks the Farm" in *Harper's* for August 1935, discussing the marvellous potentialities in synthetic chemistry. These are ways to strengthen the physical India on which economic self-sufficiency—life itself—must eventually depend. There is no conflict between a high moral life and high standards of health and physical well-being. When people are taught the values in a more ethical and intellectual life, they will use their machines to spare one another and help human beings to live with greater spiritual understanding. I do not mean that India should embrace the vices of Occidental civilization. I think a noble experiment would be to embrace the good of civilization as the West knows it, and with India's background of honesty and virtue, set up such a civilization without the corruption that now afflicts the rest of the world. Non-violence could well be a part of such a civilization ; indeed *without a practical form of non-violence, civilization of any kind —Western or Eastern—cannot survive.* In other words, I do not take exception to the non-violence part of Gandhi's programme but to his antipathy to what we understand by scientific progress.

Until India can show self-reliance and once more sustain its people and the beautiful old civilization it once enjoyed, its programme of non-violence seems nebulous and lacks power, particularly because it handicaps itself by repudiating so many aspects of the type of civilization that the West understands and is seeking to promote. The practical trouble with non-violence is that it is a language the other camp does not understand. Perhaps it is that moral substitute for war for which William James was searching. It is especially interesting as giving scope to the Indian women who under it have done so much so ably.

It is intensely interesting to the American who is at present torn by such political conflicts as now exist between democracy and fascism, democracy and communism, and the various other types of capitalism, individualism, regimentation and equally current social and economic systems, that none of them have anything to say about such tenets held by Gandhi as observing perfect chastity, adopting poverty, following truth and cultivating fearlessness. Far from adopting poverty, our hope is somehow to share the wealth, to

have an era of abundance for all. Cultivating fearlessness may be said to be a characteristic of the communist doctrine. Following truth and observing chastity are still individual virtues, while non-violence is motivated by law and order, or by cowardice, not, as in India, by true love and self-abnegation. In Western countries these Christian attitudes are merely historically interesting and theoretical. They have never yet been practised on a large scale and are still individual ideals that mellow the church-goer for an hour on Sundays. They have no real part whatever in community, national or international relations.

Economic rivalries in Asia and Europe are testing communism and fascism as against the individualistic method of America and other democracies. They have thrown their hopes in violent methods of social revolution as against India's peaceful method of social evolution which represents the most widespread attempt ever made to test the basic tenets of Christianity as a practical guide to living. Should India succeed, a renewed interest in and hope for higher ethical living would occur, the effects of which can hardly be measured or even anticipated. Truly Gandhi is like a warm, steady, comforting Gulf Stream in a cold and troubled sea of thought.

ESTELLE H. RIES

MECHANICS OF LIVING AND THE WAY OF LIFE

[**John A. Osoinach** writes with insight; he sees the possibility of his countrymen making appropriate use of Gandhiji's teachings and establishing real Swaraj in the West.—EDS.]

The essence of home rule, as propounded by Gandhi, is self-rule. Implicit in his teaching is the thought that one's real home is in one's own consciousness. With God established there, integrity and harmony will prevail within the soul and these qualities must inevitably mould external conditions to their pattern through patience, perseverance and love. That seems the necessary interpretation of what the great Indian leader calls soul force. It is the antithesis of the modern behaviouristic theory that the soul is fashioned by the impact of material conditions. Gandhi believes that the opposite is true—that the soul, if its force is properly exercised and directed, controls external conditions.

Soul force is apt to seem like an abstraction until one has experienced for himself its power in dissipating and destroying evil, and then he becomes more humble and more prepared to admit its existence and availability.

This doctrine teaches the practical application of the great proverb, "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." It requires faith, courage and patience under tribulation to put this principle to the test; but a few individual men have exemplified it by

their lives, and this is sufficient to prove that men collectively can do likewise if they will but trust it with their whole hearts.

To what extent, if at all, is the teaching of *Hind Swaraj* applicable to the United States of America ? In condemning modern civilization, Gandhi's idea seems to be that if we become too much absorbed in the mechanics of living we are apt to miss the way of life. The mechanics of living, in the United States as in all Western countries, have become all important. Giving up the means of gratifying our sense desires, our need for continuous objective occupation or entertainment, appears as a supreme act of sacrifice. Nevertheless, self-rule calls for self-sacrifice —the sacrifice or giving up of what is petty and unworthy in oneself, although never of one's true individuality.

The United States has not the same problems as India, but it has many problems. The trend toward an even intenser form of materialism is probably the greatest of them. One need only contemplate the bitter antagonism between its differing schools of political thought, the strife between capital and labour, the increasing class consciousness of its people, and the decay of self-reliance even in material measures to realize the truth of this stricture. Some form of resistance to them is assuredly indicated as an urgent necessity. But passive resistance ? It seems a contradiction in terms. *Soul force, whether applied to external conditions or to temptations within oneself, can never be passive. It is a militant force, even though inspired by love and motivated by desire for the good of all.* Non-co-operation would be a better term, carrying with it a refusal to have any participation in evil, even though suffering be the result of refusal, and a careful reading of *Hind Swaraj* will convince any one that this is the sense in which Gandhi uses the term. By passive resistance, he means only abstinence from violence, but not an adulteration of the militancy of soul force.

One of the great truths set down in this little book that needs to be more taken to heart is that an evil means can never lead to a good end. The modern world—like the ancient and medieval worlds—has never sufficiently realized that good cannot spring from evil. It is utterly contrary to spiritual law that a result can be so foreign to its cause. The history of time is full of examples of men and nations that failed because they thought to justify evil deeds by this hoary fallacy, and yet it is still considered a sound doctrine by many that a good end not only justifies but almost sanctifies any means of attainment. Gandhi has done the world true service in felling this argument at one stroke.

But when we come to consider what is inherently good we are apt to meet confusion. It is difficult for one schooled in Western thought to admit or believe that many of the adjuncts and trappings of our life are evil *per se* or can produce evil results if our motives in adapting and using them are good.

For example, it is difficult to understand how the complex life of our country could exist without

railways, particularly in view of the large number of urban communities that are completely dependent upon this form of transportation for sustenance. It is equally difficult to see how the processes of so intricate a business structure as we have evolved could continue to function without lawyers. The vast majority of our people cannot be taught enough of hygiene to get along without some form of medical attention, at least for many years to come. The trouble is that Gandhi's doctrine calls for a way of life in which simplicity is the corner-stone, and Americans are not simple people. Like most of the other peoples of the world, they have been trained to a pitiful complexity of life from which there seems no escape except through a change of base from the material to the spiritual and years of painful practice.

One cannot help but feel that the people of the United States have this in common with any people who might attempt to invoke the principle of home rule or self-rule : the real enemy to be overcome is within themselves. Passive resistance must be translated into self-conquest. Thus, the United States of America does have much to gain from a study and application of the teaching of *Hind Swaraj*. A code of simplicity and self-rule would undoubtedly result in the gradual abandonment of materialism and the re-dedication of our nation to ever higher ideals, and would furnish at least one agency for healing that sense of futility that is corroding the joy and nullifying the spiritual values of many men and women to-day.

JOHN A. OSOINACH

THE BREATH OF LIFE

The divine springs of life,
Are not more rare than this,
Which is the Infinite
Within the Finite,
And the way through which we win
Unto the ends of Life,
Even as the air we breathe,
Is all in all,
So is this Breath of Life unto the Soul.

—BARNETT R. COULAN

INDIAN OPINIONS

[As a result of enquiry among Indian friends we received a very large number of letters commenting upon the contents of our Special *Hind Swaraj* Number published last September. Below we print a very few selected criticisms : among the opinions received an overwhelming majority were in favour of full acceptance of Gandhiji's Non-Violence ideology ; a very few were totally averse to bringing religious methods into political struggles. Neither of these extreme views is represented here ; the exponents of the former gave exceedingly lengthy dissertations but indicated no new line of thought ; the latter did not offer in support of their thesis any substantial reasons worth publishing.

We have selected typical letters, each of which advances some cogent line of thought for consideration by our readers ; there are several which repeat arguments advanced in some of the letters excluded for the reasons indicated.

The first article, that of Professor A. R. Wadia, best expresses the view of a very large number. The others are also typical of the views of different groups of Indians.—EDS.]

I.—WHAT WILL ALWAYS LIVE

[**A. R. Wadia** is Professor of Philosophy in the Mysore University and succeeds Sir S. Radhakrishnan as the President of the Executive Committee of the Indian Philosophical Congress.—EDS.]

In 1908, in the comparatively obscure pages of the *Indian Opinion* in South Africa there appeared a series of articles. In the intervening years the writer has become a world figure and the articles, published as *Hind Swaraj,* a world classic. The Bombay Government in those days proscribed it. To-day nine eminent English authors have come forward in the pages of THE ARYAN PATH to bear witness to its great and enduring qualities. Mr. G. D. H. Cole finds it "a disturbing book" and Mr. John Middleton Murry hails it as "a spiritual classic". Mr. Gerald Heard is in raptures over the "vision Non-Violence opens up", and yet in the very next sentence he says : "We may never attain that level in this world", suggesting what the other writers have stated more openly. Gandhiji might well echo the words of Christ, "Oh, ye of little faith !"

For Indians the task of formulating their reactions to Gandhiji's great book is much more difficult, for no Indian can forget Gandhiji's services to Indian self-respect and political advancement, and he may not find it easy to dissociate the local from the universal in so complex a personality as Gandhiji's. Yet by an effort even an Indian may ask himself whether all that Gandhiji says and writes should necessarily be accepted at its face value. Such an effort will inevitably lead to a distinction between what is polemical and what perennial in *Hind Swaraj,* a distinction more easily perceived by one who, not in the thick of political fights, can survey the field as a spectator.

An eminent English judge is said

to have advised a junior colleague to avoid as far as possible giving reasons for his conclusions, for the conclusions are usually right, while the reasons are often wrong. This expresses my personal reaction to Gandhiji's teaching. I admire his passionate emphasis on soul-force, his Christ-like love for humanity, the weakest and the most oppressed and those who suffer most. But the chapters that lead up to this culmination have always left me cold. It may be good patriotism to say that Hindus and Muslims have become opposing factions only since the British conquest of India ; it would be truer history to say that the British won because of this opposition. It is equally doubtful whether the most fanatical follower of Gandhiji would welcome the reign of Bhils and Pindaris of the pre-British days, as Gandhiji would, in preference to British rule.

And then the violent polemic against lawyers and doctors ! After all, not all diseases can be glibly put down as due to a person's own negligence. Never has the unity of humanity been more rigorously proved than in the realm of physical health, where an epidemic takes toll of all alike, and a father's venereal disease affects his children. The doctor's noble mission is to assuage human suffering. And surely the lawyers cannot be wholly a bad lot, if within their ranks we can find an Abraham Lincoln and a Gandhi ! Gandhiji would make a subtle distinction here between the lawyer and the man, but this cuts at the very root of his polemic, for it means that the real problem for humanity is a moral one. If a man is good, the knowledge and the practice of his profession will not make him bad.

The same reasoning will apply to his anti-industrialism. " Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilisation ; it represents a great sin ", says the sage of India. " I cannot recall a single good point in connection with machinery." If these statements are taken literally, we have to put back the hand of time and begin with Rousseau's "noble savage", who existed only in his imagination. Man has attained a higher morality only because he is more civilised, and civilisation means an all-round development of man, including his intelligence and his creative faculties. Industrialism has succeeded in many ways. If it has failed, it is because of the failure of man's moral power to control the forces of industrialism. That industrialism is not bad in itself has been proved by industrialists like Henry Ford and the Leverhulme family. How the genius of India, predominantly religious, can spiritualise even machinery has been beautifully illustrated by the noble experiment at Dayalbagh under the religious inspiration of one of the greatest sons of modern India ; His Holiness the late Sahabji Maharaj. Man need not run away from industrialism like a coward. If he is truly moral, he can moralise its forces.

All this aspect of Gandhiji's teaching I take to be negative and polemical. If it has come to have any importance, it is only because he has tagged it on to his really constructive and immortal teaching, wherein he

has preached with the fire of the prophets the inherent good in man and the good that can manifest itself only through soul-force. Gandhiji thus summarises the gist of *Hind Swaraj*: "It teaches the gospel of love in the place of that of hate. It replaces violence with self-sacrifice. It pits soul-force against brute-force." Herein lies the immortality of *Hind Swaraj*. The doctrine is not new. It was preached by Buddha and spread all over Asia by Asoka. It was preached by Christ. Gandhiji's originality lies in his use of soul-force in the political sphere. He may not have succeeded in the sense in which he wished to succeed with the ruin of all our mills and the British ceasing to have anything to do with India. But he has succeeded in the sense that India has once again found her soul and has learned at his sacred feet the lesson of self-respect, of the unbending strength of humility and love. He has done for India what no other man has done in her long history. Putting India on the political map of the world is a task the herculean nature of which can be appreciated only by those who have understood the centrifugal tendency that runs right across the pages of Indian history. But great as this task has been, almost unachievable by any other Indian, it pales into insignificance before the great end that Gandhiji has set before himself: the task of the moral regeneration of the world. *Real Swaraj is self-rule or self-control.* This is not a political dictum, but fundamentally a moral dictum to be applied in all spheres of human activity, including politics. It is only a logical development of this fundamental principle to say that "If man will only realise that it is unmanly to obey laws that are unjust, no man's tyranny will enslave him." Was this not what Lovelace meant when he wrote :—

> "Stone walls do not a prison make,
> Nor iron bars a cage"?

Gandhiji is great as a teacher, but he is much greater as a man. For even when his teaching cuts right across the whole trend of civilisation to-day, his humanity towers to glorious heights, and his indomitable spirit converts cowards into heroes.

Soul-force is the central core of his teaching. He has used it himself with conspicuous success both in South Africa and in India. Oppressed unarmed peoples in other parts of the world may well look with longing eyes to him for inspiration. But can soul force always succeed? Gandhiji has no doubt about it. His English admirers, however, seem conscious of its limitations, and I find it a searching question to answer as confidently as he himself does. And why? Because man has it in him to become divine, but he is in fact also a brute. The great prophet of Ahimsa succeeded in South Africa and in India because he had to deal with two high-souled men, General Smuts and Lord Irwin, who could react sympathetically to the struggles of resolute though unarmed men and women. But can China afford to lie low before the ruthless Japanese or the Abyssinians before the Italians? If Hind Swaraj comes into being to-morrow, shall we be able to do away with the police and the army and the air force? The

answer can be affirmative only on one condition, *viz.*, that all men have been so softened and so civilised that they can appreciate the significance of soul force. In all other cases it may prove an unequal struggle doomed to failure. So we come back to *the* problem of humanity : the moralisation of man, the problem to which the prophets and the martyrs have dedicated their lives, with success just looming on the horizon. To their ranks belongs Gandhiji. It is given to man to do his best for the betterment of his fellows ; the rest is in the lap of God. If in the midst of so much evil, so much injustice, so much cruelty, life is still worth living, it is because we have men like Gandhiji to show us the way to subdue the beast in us.

A. R. WADIA

II.—INCONSISTENCY REAL AND APPARENT

[Dr. C. Narayana Menon of the Benares Hindu University is the author of *Shakespeare Criticism : An Essay in Synthesis.*—EDS.]

The penetrative insight shown by the contributors to the *Hind Swaraj* number of THE ARYAN PATH contrasts with the shallow flippancy which in the foreign press passes muster as opinion on Gandhiji's philosophy. When touching on Gandhiji's inconsistencies, however, some do not make allowance for one feature of his book. It is Gandhiji's obstinate consistency that sometimes betrays him into inconsistency.

Hind Swaraj contains a philosophy which looks very much like a programme since it was born not of intellectual detachment but of the sensitiveness of a noble heart. The contradictions of civilisation rouse passionate protest, making Gandhiji assert, for example, that doctors make disease. To use a familiar terminology of to-day, the thesis provokes him to stress the antithesis, and thus to contribute to the evolution of a future synthesis the nature of which he himself cannot determine beforehand. Hence Gandhiji's inconsistencies are more apparent than real.

When he condemned the Parliamentary system he was right: every election is an appeal to greed, pride and fear. He who rouses and plays upon the baser passions of the electorate himself becomes debased in the process. The net result is that both voters and candidates give a hostage, as it were, to the devil within themselves. Henceforth the higher human instincts are effectively curbed. International Fellowships and Leagues of Nations are rendered nugatory in times of need, for the lower nature which came to power by raising frenzies and panics will retain power through the same tactics. Thus Parliament becomes an embodiment of man's lower nature and prevents human growth. But Gandhiji's consent to try Parliamentary Swaraj in India was also right. Those who had risked life and all for truth could be expected to appeal to the nobler instincts ; and the atmosphere thus created might, in turn, strengthen the leaders to face the fiery ordeal of truth—the wielding of political

power. If legislative bodies all over the world embody the noblest aspirations of voters, civilisation is no disease.

Industrial machinery, like political, crushes us only because it expresses the lower nature. The shareholders of a company may be generous, but the company embodies only their gain-seeking aspect. *What stifles humanity to-day is the projection of the absurd myth that man is an economic animal who seeks gain and avoids pain.* The very fact that millions have scorned money and courted pain, and have made and purchased khaddar on uneconomic terms testifies to the power of the higher nature. Machinery can be made to express that. Mankind must dominate machinery or die.

That we can renounce machinery is a delusion born of fear, and fear solves no problems. After all, what is it that we dread—the intelligence with which man has been perfecting tools ever since his appearance on earth? If the sewing-machine is allowed, why should the spinning-machine be taboo? Our duty is not to bury the one talent but to trade with it and make it two. Intelligence and Soul are not incompatibles: if the Spirit shirks Intelligence and takes refuge in the isolation of the machineless, self-sufficient village, men will stagnate and deceive themselves. The mind uses memories of an idyllic, perhaps unreal, past to visualise the ideals which build the future; but the future is never a return to the past; it is always a synthesis of the forces warring in the present.

The ancients and even More's Utopians employed slaves, because, to develop the higher creative activities called art and culture, men need relief from drudgery. We have that relief. It has been estimated that, if the tools evolved by the intellect are intelligently used, each person need work only half an hour a week. But *men persist in drudgery, thereby causing unemployment,* a scramble for markets and war; or they dissipate spiritual energy in search of excitement and distraction, thereby causing wrong employment and all the degradation it implies. Both errors are traceable to the lack of liberal interests. If the taste for higher kinds of pleasure does not grow, a return to primitive methods of production is the only way to ensure the just distribution of wealth; but I believe that universal cultural education will free men from the tyranny of the lower cravings by imparting the ability to use time for self-improvement.

The central fact is that man cannot grow to his full stature in isolation. But in the absence of self-knowledge human organisations are apt to mis-express the Spirit. Where two or three are gathered together in His name Christ is present, but if the faith is not genuine Satan steps in instead. Men should realise that the truest of all impulses, that from which others like hate and envy are aberrations, is Compassion. Swaraj or the Kingdom of Heaven is this realisation; and Gandhiji's contribution is the necessary technique. The West needs it no less than the East.

C. NARAYANA MENON

III.—REASON AND INTUITION

[Dr. P. T. Raju, Sastri, of the Andhra University is the author of *Thought and Reality*.—EDS.]

Gandhiji's teachings have deeper implications than the reviewers found it possible to touch upon; nor is it possible to expound them in a really convincing manner in this letter. Sir S. Radhakrishnan once had the idea of writing a book on Gandhiji's philosophy;[1] I do not know whether he has it still. I have a similar idea; I have so far been unable to take up the work seriously, but I hope to after some time.

I am not one of those who think that the religious aspect of Gandhiji's teaching is a political ruse or that it can be understood adequately from the side of politics. It has a deeper spiritual meaning, and I agree with the editors of THE ARYAN PATH that Professor Soddy has "missed the soul of the subject". He seems to be concerned rather with the externals of Gandhiji's teaching. There is no reason for wonder in identifying civilisation with good conduct. Many Western writers differentiate between civilisation and culture, culture being something spiritual. Culture and civilisation are the internal and the external aspects of the same thing. A civilisation, to be high and true, must be based upon true culture of the Spirit, and be its expression. Then it can be good conduct also. There are civilisations and civilisations; how are we to assign them their respective values? Are we to judge the greatness of a civilisation by the number of fashions the beaux and the belles change in every week, by the kinds of destructive weapons invented, etc., or by the moral cleanliness of the people's customs, and the sincerity and the kindliness of their hearts?

Gandhiji's central idea seems to be that if every individual realises the worth of spiritual freedom and acts accordingly, the liberty of the nation is assured. This sounds individualistic; and it has certainly an ascetic tinge. But the excesses of asceticism are not essential to the doctrine. If one admits that the individuality reaches beyond social and political life, one must accept Gandhiji's teaching. I think that Mr. Cole's difficulty lies here. When the individual has acquired *Swaraj* in the personal sense, his individuality will not make unnecessary subversive incursions into the social life, and at the same time will not be a mere instrument of society. Of course in mere abstract individuality we cannot "discover terms on which we work with others

[1] Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan speaking last December in India is reported thus:

"Humanity could be saved only by applying religion in our education, politics and economics. Mahatma Gandhi was trying to achieve this in his new Wardha Scheme of Education, Harijan Uplift and the gospel of the Charka and cottage industries. World seers and saints had ever been trying to bridge the gulf between the brutal and the beautiful, by means of true religion.

"A new spirit of renaissance was awake in India and Gandhiji was its soul or life. Contemplation and meditation, combined with practical efficiency, leads us to prosperity. That is the *Bhagavad Gita's* teaching in the last chapter, which we find in Mahatmaji, who is the soul of all institutions in Wardha."

towards the realisation of our ideals", nor can we find in mere social life all the means for the realisation of our ideal of ourselves. Yet the life of the individual transcends the social. This is especially the Eastern outlook. So long as one is in society, one has to work with others ; and only when one is master of oneself can one have the desire and the courage to translate social or personal ideals into action. If we ignore the religious background of Gandhiji's teaching, this point cannot be appreciated.

That Western civilisation is mechanical is not the whole truth about it. This contention of Delisle Burns should be accepted. There is, however, a question of degree and emphasis. The mechanical nature of Western civilisation is the result of something deeper. Its outlook is that of mere reason. This should not be understood as implying that the Indian outlook is irrational and superstitious. This is a mistake which Mr. M. N. Roy committed in an address at Waltair, and which others may commit. *Western civilisation, we may say, is the civilisation of quantity, having its roots in Greek thought, with its ideal of mathematical reasoning, which is quantitative, abstract, discursive and analytical. The Indian outlook is intuitive, synthetic and concrete.* Each has its own advantages and disadvantages. And the real problem before the world is, how to bring about a harmonious blend of the two. Gandhiji's utterances sometimes seem one-sided.

To completely dispense with the machine seems beyond the powers of humanity as we now find it. In the words of Bergson, man is predominantly a machine-making and machine-using animal. Bergson tells us that intellect as distinguished from instinct is the inventor and the user of tools. Man possessing intellect naturally makes and uses tools. Even the most primitive plough, the angling-rod and the spinning-wheel are machines. If man were to dispense with all these and use only his hands and feet, it would be a problem whether the earth could support as many as it does now. There seems, however, to be a limit beyond which the invention and use of the machine seems detrimental to the spiritual growth of the individual and of society, when, instead of man being able to control the machine, the machine controls him. Here the real problem seems to be how we are to fix the limit and make our decision on this point effective. If it were possible to use the machine without material and spiritual self-devastation, then our mentality and our outlook should completely change ; each human being should be master of himself.

From this point we can fully appreciate the view that it is not the non-violence of the meek and the imbecile, but of the strong and the powerful that can be effective in overcoming the user of violence. But even then it is doubtful whether the latter will not take advantage of the fact that the former, even though powerful, will not meet violence with violence. The practice of this principle on a universal scale seems possible only when every heart is morally sound, when no one wants more than his necessities and his fair share of comforts, when all are equally provided for, and

so forth ; that is, when every cause for interfering with others' lives, directly or indirectly, is removed.

I find myself in general agreement with the views of several of the English critics of *Hind Swaraj*. The parallelism between Gandhiji's and H. P. Blavatsky's views is very interesting.

P. T. RAJU

IV.—A HINDU VIEW

[Rao Saheb Mahakavi Ullur S. Paramesvara Aiyar, M.A., B.L., retired Dewan Peishkar is a well-known Malayalam poet.—EDS.]

"Soul Force" as an ideal is unimpeachable and it is towards the attainment of that ideal that humanity must ever painfully and patiently persevere. But in that noble endeavour stern facts, political, economic and social, which stare us in the face at present, cannot be overlooked. The use of machinery on a large scale was condemned in ancient India ; Manu taboos "*Mahayantrapravartanam.*" Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that modern machinery, though no unmixed blessing, has come to stay. It has emancipated man from the drudgery of ages and has released him for higher work. The woeful fact that to-day it has introduced much suffering among the labouring classes and has become a powerful engine for human destruction is a great defect ; but it is not an irremediable one. Again, the ideal of Soul Force is itself not new to India. It is as old as Prahlada of the Puranas, and Kshemendra, the great Cashmerean poet, narrates a typical episode extolling it in his *Bodhisatvadanakalpalata*. Numerous verses are found in Buddhistic as well as in Hindu literature.

The sudden and menacing rise of totalitarian States introduces problems of great complexity and the international question arises, how organised physical force can be successfully met otherwise than by counterforce until, at any rate, the majority of nations are prepared to band together in the interest of the peaceful and orderly progress of the world and are able to overawe an outlaw by their sheer moral strength. It is impossible to contemplate a period, at least in the immediate future, when the use of force, as an unwilling, but at the same time an indispensable, instrument of moral authority can be wholly dispensed with. Gandhiji's message possesses supreme value as applied to the individuals that compose a nation ; and it is only by the practice of the truth expounded in that message that they will be able to rise to their full moral stature. But a clear distinction has to be drawn between individual and corporate activity. There is a Gresham's Law in politics as in economics, and practical statesmen have to take account of it and to get rid of the bad coins by every means in their power, including physical force in the last resort. A nation composed wholly of saints never won or retained their independence in this work-a-day world of mixed good and evil, nor is it likely to do so until

the majority of nations obey the law of love, which is decidedly not the case at present. This fact is sure to become patent to the Congress itself when India attains Swaraj. Every nation has both to have faith in God and to keep its powder dry, under existing conditions. Nevertheless whatever one may say by way of criticism, there is no doubting the fact that the present work of Gandhiji is even more epoch-making than Rousseau's *Social Contract* or Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, as correctly observed by Gerald Heard. It deserves the most careful study.

S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR

V.—A MUSLIM VIEW

[**M. Fathulla Khan** is the author of *Musk Dust, The Cobbler and Other Short Stories,* and *The Ships and Boats of the Ajanta Frescoes.*—EDS.]

The difficulty with Gandhiji is that he advocates doctrines that are in direct conflict with the laws of nature. Simply because humanity is suffering and a remedy has to be found, you cannot suggest something which is unnatural, impracticable. To avoid war, surely you would not throttle the growth of intelligence in the realm of science. Passive resistance is the only weapon that the ascetic, the unarmed and the weak can lay his hands on. Only in the presence of love can love flourish. To expect love in the midst of hatred is to labour under self-deception. In this matter-of-fact world, Gandhiji's ideas, however ennobling and sublime they may appear, can hardly influence the mind of the universe. For they are not in agreement with the laws of nature. This was the impression I had formed of Gandhiji's *Hind Swaraj* when it first appeared years ago ; and I have not found it possible to alter my views in the interval.

Every civilization has been the outcome of circumstances ; and one civilization is replaced by another only when circumstances make the former incapable of thriving longer. The succeeding civilization may or may not be superior to the previous one, but none in the long history of the making of humanity has ever gone back to that state wherein the growth of human mind was muzzled. But Gandhiji seems to advocate going back to a state of primitive mind where human happiness is looked upon as consisting of mere elementary pleasures and to demand the suppression of creative energy and the impulse for development, simply because he has a quarrel with Western civilization. In the civilization of his dream, I do not find any scope for *thinking*, but only for a life of contentment and inanition, such as the Indian villager lives to-day. So whether Gandhiji's own country, not to think of the West, will ever be prepared to set back the hand on the clock of its progress (which is definitely on the lines of Western civilization) is a question which, I am afraid, Gandhiji himself will hesitate to answer.

Though Gandhiji has avoided

criticism by acknowledging in this booklet that his "corporate activity is devoted to the attainment of Parliamentary Swaraj in accordance with the wishes of the people of India", yet a careful analysis of his writings and speeches will reveal many contradictions and inconsistencies, as if his mind is still in an experimental stage.

Here it is that the Hindu view of life is seen as diametrically opposed to that of the Muslim. In Islam, man should cultivate his latent faculties and employ them for the benefit of his fellows. Islam declares that the whole universe is under the realm of law, which is unchangeable, and that implicit obedience to those laws which in scientific phraseology have been termed the "laws of nature" would bring happiness and prosperity to the human race. According to the *Qur'an,* the scientific researches and material progress which are made with moral equipment are alone those which will constitute true civilization and bring the real kingdom of God on earth.

Freedom of action and independence of judgment are exalted in Islam. Man is asked to use his intellect and not to accept anything unless tested on the anvil of reason. And history teaches us that a large measure of free thought is absolutely necessary to human progress.

It is true that uncompromising loyalty to truth, absolute freedom from aggression, revenge and anger, willingness to suffer rather than to inflict suffering on others, which factors constitute the doctrine of passive resistance, when analysed are the teachings of Islam. How often does the *Qur'an* bid Muslims practise as well as preach "forbearance", which has as its main ingredients harmlessness, coolness and truth. Even in times of the greatest distress man is enjoined to "seek help with forbearance and prayer". It is natural to resent opposition and to long for retaliation; but forbearance on such occasions is an act of distinctive merit. But forbearance out of weakness is not a virtue. Deliberate abstinence from all retaliatory measures while they are within easy reach is what the word signifies. And the *Qur'an* emphasises this aspect.

To my mind, Gandhiji's ideals are likely to appeal to ascetics rather than to those who have to live in the throes of a developed human consciousness.

M. FATHULLA KHAN

VI.—THE RELIGION OF THE SAGES

[**Dr. Dhirendra Nath Roy,** formerly Head of the Department of Philosophy of the University of the Philippines, is the author of several books, the latest of which is *The Spirit of Indian Civilization.*—EDS.]

Human nature seeks the realisation of the ideal world and thus gives itself a better meaning. Now, man can hardly conceive of violence existing in the ideal world. If we study the pictures of heaven conceived by the great religions of the world, we find that violence has little or no place in it. The ordinary unthinking masses yearn for their heavenly home be-

cause it represents those things that are agreeable to their true nature and because they fail to realise them in this world. The thinking people may not take that idea of heaven seriously because they are more or less able to live in their own thought-world in which the ideal is more powerful than the real. If human nature were as a whole as depraved as we are told, then our love for a world different from what strikes our senses would have no meaning. It cannot think of violence existing in its ideal world, because it cannot approve of it. Violence is acceptable to those only who, by shutting themselves against the ideal world, give the real an absolute meaning which alone envelops their mental horizon and seeks to overpower their whole nature.

If violence were the true meaning of human nature, non-violence would be quite alien to it. But non-violence has inspired human nature much more than violence. How many people in the world feel truly interested in Alexander, Cæsar, or Napoleon, in Chengis Khan, Taimur, or Mohammed Ghori ? Their reputation has only a geographical and temporal meaning. They are feared, but not loved and never worshipped. And yet the prophets and the saints of the different religions are so immortalised, loved and worshipped by men. Why ? Because those prophets and saints upheld non-violence or what we in India call *Ahimsa* as the basic creed of all that they held as the best and noblest.

The great religions of the world all agree in upholding the truth of Ahimsa. That Ahimsa has been preached by the great seers of all times shows in a way that truth has its essential relation with it. That the people even of the present day read and reread the fine ancient expressions about Ahimsa and feel highly inspired thereby goes to show that human nature is in true agreement with it.

This cult of Ahimsa is the very essence of Hinduism and is found in its earliest literature. Thus it is said,

> Do not return a blow by a blow nor a curse by a curse, neither mean craftiness by base tricks, but shower blessings in return for blows and curses. (*Rig Veda* I. 41. 9)

> He who sees all beings in Atman and Atman in all beings does not for that reason hate anybody. (*Ishopanishad*, 6)

> The true mark of wisdom is the absence of self-adulation, boastfulness and violence, in the spirit of forgiveness and simplicity." (*Gita* 13. 8)

> The observance of strict self-control and non-violence is called the meditation of the body. (*Ibid.* 17. 14)

Buddhism may be regarded as almost synonymous with non-violence. The following quotations are translated by A. J. Edmunds from the *Dhammapada* :—

> Putting away violence 'mid weak or strong,
> Who slayeth not, nor slaughter causeth
> Him I call a Brahmin.
> Overcome anger with kindness,
> Overcome evil with good,
> Overcome meanness with a gift,
> Ay, and a liar with truth.
> There is no fire like passion.
> No monster like unto hate.
> At the rod do all men tremble ;
> Unto all men life is dear ;
> Do as you would be done by ;
> Kill not nor cause to kill.

How such noble teachings of the great Buddha were taken by his fol-

lowers could be imagined from a conversation which Buddha had with a merchant who joined his society and solicited permission from him to preach the noble doctrine to his relations.

"The people of Suanaparanta", said Buddha, "are exceedingly violent; if they revile you what will you do?"

"I will make no reply", said the merchant.

"And if they strike you?"

"I will not strike in return."

"And if they kill you?"

"Death", said the merchant, "is no evil in itself. Many even desire it to escape from the vanities of life." (Bigandet, p. 216)

In China the two master spirits of its hoary culture were Confucius and Lao-Tze. The famous Golden Rule which was first preached by Buddha was stated by Confucius only in a different form. "Do not do unto others", said he, "as you would they should not do unto you." Similarly it was said by Lao-Tze,

To those who are good I am good and to those who are not good I am also good; thus all grow to be good. To those who are sincere I am sincere; and to those who are not sincere I am also sincere; thus all grow to be sincere.

The great Iranian civilization was founded on the noble doctrine of Zoroaster which runs thus: "Humata, Hukhta, and Hvrashta: Good Thoughts, Good Words, and Good Deeds". They are reminiscent of the Hindu doctrine of Ahimsa in mind, word and body.

In ancient Greece the same spirit of non-violence triumphed when the immortal Socrates preached from behind the prison bars not to return evil for evil. Socrates said to Crito, one of his most devoted and rich friends,

"And what of doing evil in return for evil, which is the morality of the many—is that just or not?"

Crito. "Not just."

Socrates. "For doing evil to another is the same as injuring him."

Crito. "Very true."

Socrates. "Then we ought not to retaliate or render evil to any one, whatever evil we may have suffered from him."

The great Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius upheld the same spirit of Ahimsa. Thus he said,

When a man has done thee any wrong, immediately consider with what opinion about good or evil he has done wrong. For when thou hast seen this thou wilt pity him and wilt neither wonder nor be angry. For either thou thyself thinkest the same thing to be good that he does or another thing of the same kind. It is thy duty then to pardon him. But if thou dost not think such things to be good or evil, thou wilt more readily be well-disposed to him who is in error.

The well-known Stoic philosopher Cicero said,

Let us not listen to those who think we ought to be angry with enemies and who believe this to be great and manly. Nothing is so praiseworthy, nothing so clearly shows a great and noble soul as clemency and readiness to forgive.

Christianity owes its origin to the same lofty spirit of Ahimsa. The death of Jesus Christ was by itself one of the finest examples of that noble ideal. He was crucified for preaching what he considered as truth and even when dying a most horrible death he wished the good of his persecutors. Here are a few of his golden sayings which are commonly known as the "Sermon on the Mount":

Ye have heard the saying, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But

I tell you, you are not to resist an injury.

Whoever strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other to him as well. Whoever wants to sue you for your shirt, let him have your coat as well. Whoever forces you to go one mile, go two miles with him.

Ye have heard the saying, 'You must love your neighbour and hate your enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you that you may be sons of your Father in Heaven.

(Matt. 5. 38-41, 43-45)

Again in the epistles of St. Paul we find expressions similar to those of Jesus : "Bless them which persecute you ; bless, and curse not."

Recompense to no man evil for evil.....Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath : for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink : for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

(Romans, 12. 14, 17-21)

Why do people consider these utterances so beautiful, so precious ? Why are they so appealing to all men with all their racial, geographical, social, and creedal differences? These utterances were made thousands of years ago and yet they are never old, never uninspiring. They were made by persons of different races and yet all races join in admiration and love for them. The truth is, they touch our real nature which reflects our permanent being. If human nature is something universal and unchangeable, its meaning can never be found in brute violence.

There is no universal approbation of violence. But no man can help being impressed when violence is answered by non-violence. It is the expression of the true man in us. If we commit violence and then try to justify ourselves, it is because our true nature becomes overpowered by animal passion and when we regain ourselves we try to avert our mental and moral agonies by rationalising our acts as natural. The repetition of such acts is a process of animalisation which means the inevitable atrophy of the real spirit of human nature.

This does not mean that the animal is entirely absent in human nature. In fact, it should be there if man is the highest form of microcosm. But his true nature is found in his struggle to humanize the little of the animal that is still in him. It is wonderful that man is endowed with that sense of responsibility.

Those who contend that it is not possible to humanize the animal in man maintain a very poor notion of man. It is not impossible, though it may not be easy. The potential capacities of man are never fully realised. So, there is no ideal which man can conceive that he cannot attain. And if some men did, by their own effort, attain a true spirit of non-violence, it is right and logical to conclude that all men can.

It is not easy to develop the pure spirit of non-violence, but it is not proper to turn away from that ideal. Man saves himself by constantly adhering to a principle which is always rising, by going upwards after every fall from above. He is bound to fail if he is satisfied with his *status quo*, for there is no such thing in human life as is not moving, ever push-

ing to transcend its own conscious limitations. An earnest desire to attain to the pure form of non-violence is an indirect means of raising oneself from the slough of animality, nearer to the ideal sphere of humanity.

To cultivate the purest spirit of non-violence which is latent in all men requires the maximum of mental strength. Non-violence does not spring from mental weakness. A person who is harmless because he is helpless is not really non-violent ; in fact he does not mean to be so. Physical non-violence if not inspired from within is only an external imposition and as such it implies slavery. The true spirit of non-violence comes from within, it cannot be imposed from without.

To maintain a mental atmosphere of non-violence means an adjustment of our different impulses and inclinations so as to form a personality which is at peace with itself. Violence is inspired by our confusion of thought due to the conflicting inward tendencies. But when a true personality is attained through an adjustment of these tendencies our mental state attains its equanimity through the organization and co-ordination of our impulses and desires. It is the first fruit of our cultivation of the spirit of non-violence. Or conversely, the spirit of non-violence evolves itself from the organization and co-ordination of our impulses. This means that when one is achieved the other follows as a necessary consequence.

But neither can be achieved without the thorough discipline of our thought, speech and action. If violence expresses itself through any one of these the other two will sooner or later imbibe the same spirit. When one harbours violence in his mind the fire continues to burn within until it bursts forth into speech and action. Similarly, when one indulges in violent language or action one's thought-world may soon catch the contagion.

The person who harbours the spirit of violence hurts himself far more than he hurts others. It tells upon his physical as well as his mental system and may even turn him into a regular psychopath. Ahimsa, on the other hand, helps one to build up a strong, *i.e.*, a pure personality which can move the world. There is no other secret in the lives of those who have been immortalised as saints and prophets.

D. N. Roy

THE RELIGION OF SATYAGRAHA

[Some of the preceding articles on *Hind Swaraj* raise certain questions and doubts, most of which are due to the difficulties which arise when individuals look at what to them are strange and revolutionary doctrines through the spectacles of inherited and acquired views. All such and others will find the following lucid presentation of great value. Particularly we should like to stress our esteemed contributor's idea about "the mental thraldom" of young India of to-day, and in that connection H. P. Blavatsky's major part in initiating in the eighties of the last century the popular revulsion among Indians against the systematic misprision of the nation's cultural heritage should not be overlooked. Had it not been for her work, "everything good in India" would have come much nearer to being destroyed before Gandhiji began his mission.—EDS.]

GANDHISM AS I UNDERSTAND IT

[**Manu Subedar, B.A., B.Sc., Econ. (London), Barrister-at-Law, M.L.A.,** is the translator of *Dnyaneshwari* which H. P. Blavatsky described as the "King of mystic works."—EDS.]

"The principal purpose of a man's life is to make the acquaintance of his Maker", says Gandhiji. While this is more or less the teaching of every religion, the excellence of Gandhism arises from the fact that this acquaintance is to be sought not by any standard and ceremonial worship, nor by any outward forms of obeisance. There is no injunction of intense individual prayer or of community prayer. Everybody is left to observe whatever forms of faith he feels like observing. Respect for every religion, tolerance for the followers of every faith and intense appreciation of the good in others are the key-note.

The principal path of reaching God, according to Gandhism, is the service of man. The Mahatma himself has eschewed all worldly possessions (through a vow of "*Aparigraha*"). He is living not the life of pomp and circumstance, but the simple existence of the simple folk who are economically downtrodden. This becomes a perpetual reminder to a man that every other human being is in every respect the same as himself. Starting with this innate feeling, not merely of equality but of oneness, it is impossible not to be impelled powerfully to strive to raise the status of all who for any reason have not secured a fair deal. The fact that the attention of the Mahatma was directed to the plight of the Harijans demonstrates how he has hit upon the proper Eastern counterpart of the Western notions of a minimum standard of living, and how he has, at various times and at great risk to himself, fought for this end. The Mahatma then directed his attention to the agricultural masses who, again, through the relentless forces of greed and exploitation at the hands of both foreigners and Indians, have been reduced to a pitiable condition. Much of their occupation in handicrafts is gone. Their economic self-sufficiency is no more. They are carrying an oppressive burden of land revenue, rent and interest, making it impossible for them to have the motive for improving agriculture, even if they had the

resources.

The general doctrine of truth and non-violence in its simplest phase, as applied to the everyday conduct of a human being towards other human beings, implies straightforward dealing, free from malice and hatred. Non-violence of this character requires enormous courage—courage to overcome internal impulses of greed and anger and courage often to go counter to the established code of social manners and the established prejudices and traditions of the privileged classes in every society ; but, in effect, the equality of men and the fundamental unity of human life are emphasised. A desire for scrupulous justice, accompanied by the effort to love even a wrongdoer, is imposed on the disciple of this faith. It is not easy to separate the man from the wrong which he is doing, particularly when one occupies a place of authority and has to deal with questions of discipline. To obtain the trust and the friendship of an enemy seems almost a contradiction in terms, but a finer nature can reach these heights. Pretence or cheating of any kind has no place in this philosophy. It is not merely an impression created in the mind of the other man, but a matter of deep faith for oneself, that, while trying to remove injustice aimed at oneself and others, one still desires the highest welfare of his enemy. Enmity then is not towards persons, but towards evil tendencies in them.

If God is truth, the search for God must involve the highest individual preparation for finding truth. It is only when physical grossness is eschewed and mental balance is secured, that truth will dawn. The elimination of selfishness and the assiduous suppression of selfish ends is the beginning of the realisation of the highest truth, *viz.*, that the individual self of man is, under many limitations, *Paramatman*—the Soul of all things—the Highest. If one were to seek for this true happiness through doing good to others, the question of greed would generally get subordinated, until it became extinct. Petty purposes cease to worry the seeker, but lifelong habits, tradition, the consequences of surroundings and of company can be overcome only after prolonged effort and a general feeling, not merely of the worthlessness of material possessions, but of the impermanent satisfaction obtainable from worldly conditions.

In the centre of the teachings of Gandhiji, stands the doctrine of the knowledge of self. No one can serve others, unless he has disciplined himself and developed certain qualities. Soul force, which is greater than all other forces, can arise only from the realisation that a man's true existence is with reference to his soul and not with reference to the world, in which he has a name and a body, and of which he is a unit. In its social bearing, the qualities of soul which a man must cultivate are humility and the desire rather to give to others than to take away anything from anybody. The Mahatma has written frequently on the qualities of the *Satyagrahi, i.e.*, the man whose exclusive concern is the pursuit of truth. The highest amongst these qualities is the absence of hatred and intolerance.

The Law of Karma has many

variations and designations in other schools of thought. It is accepted also as a postulate in Gandhism. The circumstances and the surroundings in which one is born and in which one grows, the success or otherwise which one meets with, the physical and mental powers or weaknesses of a man, the coincidence by which he attracts or repels others—all depend on some inexorable spiritual law. But every man can, within certain limits, in this very life mould even these externals. They cease to be of serious importance as soon as the light of the soul dawns in one. From a multiplicity of desires, a stage is reached where a man's desires become concentrated, and the more selfless he becomes, the more he seeks harmony with his surroundings and yearns for success only in one direction, *viz.*, the service of others. The resentment of those who have recoiled from a religion consisting of ceremonials—the outside shell from which the kernel is gone—at the effort of Mahatma Gandhi to bring religion to bear on problems of individual conduct, as well as on major issues of the social, economic and political life of the country, can be understood.

* * * *

The root difficulty with every individual is that his mind is constantly working from one set of desires, ambitions or attractions, to another. Through this arises weakness. Once a man has been touched with the desire to know himself, there will be an increasing number of occasions when he will turn away from the world and look within himself, but he will be unable to sustain himself on these heights. It will not be a normal or a continuous process, as it is with those who have stabilised their mind and intelligence and planted them firmly in the heart. Deep faith is wanted, accompanied by a feeling of renunciation in order to secure this constancy and this balance. These facts are common to Gandhism and to all other sets of doctrines. But the Mahatma, by example and precept, by emphasis on the value of a vow, by eschewing pomp and circumstance, by the reduction of wants and the adoption of the simple life, by self-imposed poverty, by fixing on himself responsibility for the suffering of others and in a thousand small but very effective ways, has given his followers a simple code to enable them to fix their minds on human service and the search for truth as the royal road to better acquaintance with the Spirit within.

* * * *

Earnest men and women in the West, puzzled by the conditions of their civilization, are beginning to realise that something is lacking. They are seeking for the Light. Hearing a little about the doctrines of Gandhiji, they want to learn more. But who is going to preach these doctrines and to get them accepted in practice in Europe, is a question which the practical Western mind would immediately ask. The answer is, let a few men, who believe and who have faith, begin to live this life and the rest will follow. And those few men are arising.

While the West is beginning to weigh the import of these doctrines, in India their acceptance is confined

to a very limited circle of the followers of the Mahatma and, even amongst these, few live up to them. In India, there is the glamour of the West, the hankering after modernisation. Extreme competition, impoverishment and very slow progress towards freedom, assisted by the results of Westernisation in Japan, Turkey and Afghanistan, have led young Indians to seek guidance from the West. Western thinkers, brilliant in the first steps, but generally failing to reach the final solution, attract them. The degeneration created by the British rule has led the young folk to search outside, where they are torn between the doctrines of Fascism and of Communism. These men with half-digested knowledge are still not ready to absorb the fundamentals on which Indian polity could be based and, indeed, the whole world polity could rest. The mental thraldom imposed by foreign education and the studied devaluation of everything Eastern, would have destroyed everything good in India but for the surge of nationalism and the mass awakening resulting from the doctrines of the Mahatma. Courage even unto death in the cause of truth had been heard of before, but has been demonstrated in India only recently. The results produced have made young persons falter. They are turning back and giving an eye to the political doctrines of Gandhiji. What they cannot yet adapt themselves to, is that part of his teaching which enjoins personal discipline, abstinence and simplicity. The political truth regarding the freedom of India appeals to them, but its counterpart and its inner essential —the removal from their own natures of violence, of hatred, of intolerance, and above all, of selfishness—has not yet caught them.

* * * *

The reaction of the Western mind to any criticism of machines, complex financial organizations, specialised services, experts, parliaments and empires, is hostile, but without understanding. The highest moral doctrine is that everybody must work. The aim of every social organization should be to secure for every one the opportunity to work. The extent to which machines and the trade created by them, penetrating into the remotest parts of the world, have destroyed human labour and the scope and opportunity for human work, is terrible. One must learn, however, not to hate the machines, but to love humanity. Promptly the cynic will ask, what is to be done with the machines already invented? As a device for saving human effort, use may be made of them as of all natural and physical advantages. No one has suggested that, when fresh water is available, distilled water must be created from the sea for everyday use. That the machines have dominated not only the men who were working but the men who produced and who owned the machines and made them forget their obligations towards other human beings, is written large in the industrial history of every Western country. This result could not have been produced if the leadership of society had been in the hands of men with awakened souls, *i.e.*, with a feeling of identity with other human beings and with a feeling of respon-

sibility for their welfare. That these qualities can be cultivated has been demonstrated. That they could be instilled into an ever-increasing number of human beings, is also credible. If, under the name of patriotism, violent hatreds leading to the senseless slaughter of innocent persons during war can be created by propaganda and corporate effort, why should not the same propaganda and corporate effort give as much assistance in the production of good as they have given hitherto in the production of evil ?

Anti-war theses have given glamorous statistics of the prosperity which could have been brought to every man, woman and child in Europe, if the expenditure on armaments and on the last war had been avoided over a stretch of years. An Indian under the influence of Gandhism would point out not the material but the other results, *viz.*, the elimination or the substantial reduction of crime, of disease, of frustration and of humiliation of vast masses, and generally the establishment of human responsibility, from the organization of society on the basis of non-violence. In such an organization the primary self-directive impulses known to the average human being in the West would have received a serious check from other desires strongly stimulated, aiming not at taking something from others, but at giving one's best to others, leading to a balance between what is contributed by an individual to the general life and what is taken from that general life by the individual. The life of the spirit should not be a superior pose or an occasional nicety to be indulged in as a hobby. It must in all cases be a corrective and a balancing factor to physical life. But it must be more the foundation on which the rest of existence depends. Restraints arising out of family discipline or the discipline of society through laws are known and understood, but Gandhiji's teachings seek to evaluate in the interest of the human race, the restraints which can be imposed on himself by a man who has begun the search for the spiritual life.

When you visit the West, they show you with great pride roads, buildings, communications, palaces or town halls, museums and libraries. As proofs of achievement and civilization, these are put forward. The follower of Gandhiji would say, in all humility, that it is better for a country to show a fully developed human being, who leads the life of the Soul, than to show all these. From one torch, many lamps could be lighted. The value of human civilization must be put in the ascendancy of the moral motive—not merely as expressed in words, but as it is lived. Where are the physical monuments of civilizations prior to that which is known to us now in the West ? There is something greater than those achievements, and it is the purpose of the Mahatma's teaching not only to bring this out, but to extol it as the highest aim of human life. Once that aim was accepted, applications to social and political organization and economic and physical production and distribution would inevitably follow.

MANU SUBEDAR

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

"THE UNIVERSE IS PERVADED BY DEITY"*

In his admirable introduction to this book, Mr. Sarma tells that the Sutra is a literary form peculiar to India—that "It is a mnemonic formula from which every unnecessary word is removed." He then goes on to tell us that he, with the help of Sanskrit scholars, has condensed the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi into the one hundred and eight Sutras; and that, in place of the traditional commentary, extracts from the Mahatma's speeches and writings are given in order to amplify and illuminate each individual Sutra.

It follows, therefore, that this book is concerned with quintessences. In the narrow confines of the hundred and fifty pages, it claims to present, with commentary, the whole of the Mahatma's teaching. So it is clear that to review this work in a book of equal length would be no small achievement.

In view of the above, what justification is there for selecting one of these Sutras rather than another? Especially as they are classified in three divisions: the first dealing with general principles; the second with Satyagraha; and the third with Non-Co-operation and Civil Disobedience, the two main branches of Satyagraha. The selection of one particular Sutra can be justified only if it enshrines the fundamental theme of them all.

This is the third Sutra of the first division:—

The Veda says: "The universe is pervaded by God."

Concerning this Sutra, the Mahatma writes: "I have come to the final conclusion that if all the Upanishads and all the other scriptures happened all of a sudden to be reduced to ashes and if only the first verse of the Ishopanishad ("All this—whatever there is in the universe—is pervaded by God. Renounce it and enjoy. Do not covet the wealth of another.") were left intact in the memory of Hindus, Hinduism would live for ever." And he also says: "I have in my search of the scriptures of the world found nothing to add to this..." It seems therefore that there is justification for regarding this Sutra as the main theme of the Mahatma's teaching.

To discover a main theme was essential, for, superficially, these Sutras are concerned with a bewildering number of seemingly diverse subjects:—Agriculture and weaving; art; cow protection; violence and cowardice; fasting; marriage; culture; untouchables; etc.; etc. And yet, no matter which aspect of life is illuminated in these Sutras, they are organically related, because each and all radiate from a central conception—the conception that life is a sacrament, and that therefore, in every activity, we stand upon holy ground. Life is a sacrament because "The universe is pervaded by God." Everything must be spiritualised—because everything is spiritual. That would seem to be the fundamental theme of the Mahatma's teaching.

As one reads this book, one is forced to the conclusion that Gandhi—like other great teachers—makes one remarkable assumption in all that he writes and in all that he says. This assumption is that mankind shares his own consuming passion for Truth. That, above all else, men worship and venerate God. That He is the supreme desire of their hearts. For the great teachers are those who love one thing supremely, but we lesser men love all sorts of things a little, and none of them very ardently, and none of them very long.

Wilde wrote in *De Profundis* that: "It is so difficult to keep the heights the

**The Gandhi Sutras.* By D. S. SARMA, M.A. (G. S. Press, Madras. Re. 1/8)

soul is competent to gain." And he might have added that many of us soon cease even to desire those heights. We weary of the struggle. And so it would seem that there is a gulf fixed between us and the great teachers whose desire is constant, and who see always and only the goal. A gulf so great that we are tempted to believe that their assumptions reveal everything about them, and very little about us.

And so the great question stands: How shall they quicken in us the consuming desire which animates them? How shall they wake in us that passion for Truth which burns in them? How shall they transform our little loves for the many into a unified love for the One? That is the great question, for, lacking this desire in the hearts of common humanity, the world will remain the world. It is the desire of the heart which is made manifest, not the mumbled prayer of the lips.

Nothing is easier, in reading works of a high spiritual order, than to believe that we share the aspirations expressed, the victories won. It is easy because it flatters our vanity. Actually, of course, it is given only to the greatest to love mankind. To know men, and to love them, is the supreme achievement of supreme vision. Theoretically, it is not difficult to "love". And, to-day, many who have become afraid of their contempt for humanity, and their contempt for themselves, are busy training themselves to love mankind. But Love is not a concept. It is the brimming overflow of the grace of God. Many men who are great, but not of the greatest, men who see far, and see clearly, are outcasts from the Kingdom, because they lack the one key which will unlock the gates.

To read this book is to realise the implications inherent in our professed beliefs. "The universe is pervaded by God?" Yes, of course, we believe it. Well, the implications of that belief are set forth here. If the universe is pervaded by God, then, life is a sacrament. There is no place for your feet that is not holy. You have kinship with all that lives and breathes—with all that loves, suffers and dies. Whatever happens to another, happens to you—to all. You are "responsible for all to all". You can claim nothing for your own, except the extent to which you have come short of the glory of God.

This book challenges us, not with a new and an alien belief, but with the implications of our own creed.

CLAUDE HOUGHTON

The Gandhian Way. By ACHARYA J. B. KRIPALANI. (Vora & Co., Bombay. Rs. 2.)

Non-violent Revolution. By ACHARYA J. B. KRIPALANI. (Vora & Co., Bombay. As. 4.)

Revolution or Counter-Revolution. By JAIRAMDAS DOULATRAM. (Vora & Co., Bombay. As. 2.)

Mr. Kripalani, General Secretary of the National Congress, is a political realist with an uncommon gift of shrewd statement, who champions Gandhi's methods primarily because they work. He does not reveal his own philosophic or religious beliefs; and probably as a practical politician he does not regard them as relevant: but he is perfectly certain that Gandhi has discovered the appropriate political technique for the Indian Nationalist movement for a good many years to come. Much of *The Gandhian Way* is devoted to controversy with Indian Communists, which is generally a dull business; but Mr. Kripalani, by his courtesy and humour, contrives to be unusually readable in this vein. I regret the more that the book is disfigured by a considerable number of serious misprints, which interpose a psychological barrier between it and the English reader: for this is a book which is peculiarly full of interest for the English student of Indian politics. Not only does it contain some valuable psychological and economic information—for example, that there is still a widespread demand that the Indian politician should

conform to ascetic standards; and that the percentage of the population of India dependent upon agriculture is steadily increasing—but the general temper of Mr. Kripalani's comment is remarkably free from prejudice, extravagance, fanaticism and claptrap. He is a realist, but not a cynic; and, if we may regard him as a fair (though exceptionally gifted) example of the Congress politician who is a follower of Gandhi, the prospects of India's political future are far more encouraging than the majority even of sympathetic Englishmen are inclined to believe.

It would be unreasonable to judge these publications by followers of Mr. Gandhi by the standards of their master. *Hind Swaraj* expounds, with the concision and clarity of deep insight, a comprehensive philosophy of life; in it Satyagraha, as a moral and religious attitude, is indissolubly linked with a repudiation of machine-civilization and Western political democracy, and the ideal is rigorously inculcated of a return to a society based on the simple agricultural community. Thus Gandhi is separated by what is almost a spiritual hiatus from those of his political followers for whom the civilization, the democratic institutions and the nationalism of the West are the *summum bonum*. It is impossible to tell from these publications how far their authors hold the Western faith. Both speak frequently of the desirability of "revolution"; but neither makes clear the nature of the revolution he desires. I am ignorant of the details of the actual political situation in India; but it seems to me plain that Gandhi's whole-hearted participation in Indian politics, and the decisive influence of that participation, depend upon his conviction that the means are more important than the end. He is willing to take part in politics, because he believes that by so doing he can create a movement of spiritual and religious renovation congenial to Hindu tradition and the spirit of the Indian peasantry. As Mr. Kripalani says:—

> He accepts non-violence in deed as even a religious reformer accepts external conformity in conduct in the belief that this conformity produces habits of conduct which ultimately may and many times do affect the mind and change the heart.

In this crucial matter of non-violence, conformity is something more than external conformity. "Do the works, and ye shall know the doctrine." And it would be presumptuous to assert that any man's non-violent resistance was entirely superficial; but those of whom this could be asserted with the least degree of injustice are surely those for whom non-violence is exclusively a successful political technique. Mr. Doulatram comes slightly nearer to this position than Mr. Kripalani, but he nowhere really accepts it. He endorses non-violence, not simply because it has been successful, but because the weapon "was dug out of the Indian soil", and because it is an instrument of true discipline.

> It is under the sheltering wing of non-violence that the tremendous mass-awakening, which is daily developing, has been made possible. So long as, in practice, the Congress maintains this atmosphere and lays upon it the necessary emphasis, so long will the process of organizing and disciplining the broad masses of India be a practicable programme.

This is an unexceptionable statement. Non-violence is there regarded as a process of moral and political education. It is not simply a means to a particular political end: but it is as it were consubstantial with the emergence of a new capacity for organized political action which can, so long as non-violence is held to be the primary imperative, never be wholly perverted to unworthy ends. Mr. Doulatram's idea of the true political and social goal of India is probably very different from Mr. Gandhi's; and I doubt whether Mr. Kripalani's is entirely the same: but so long as they sincerely accept non-violence as an end in itself no less than a means, they may fairly claim to be loyal disciples of their master.

J. MIDDLETON MURRY

A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam. By REGINALD LE MAY : With a Foreword by Sir John Marshall. (Cambridge University Press. 42*s.*)

"To know Indian art in India alone", says Sir John Marshall in his foreword to this book, "is to know but half its story". We are familiar with the story of Buddhist art in Central Asia and the immensely fruitful Buddhist influence on the art of China and Japan. But the story of the early and long continued emigrations from India to the Farther East, the South of China, and the Malay Archipelago, to the consequences of which Cambodia owes the magnificence of Angkor and Java the beautiful sculptures of Borobodhur,—this is a story full of deepest interest indeed, but singularly baffling and obscure. To dispel some of this obscurity in regard to one of the countries concerned, Siam, and its Buddhist art, is the object of this volume. Dr. le May has spent many years in Siam, speaks the language, and has visited all the sites and monuments he mentions; he has studied the arts of India and Ceylon, and approaches his subject with sympathy. He acknowledges a great debt to the French archæologists who have done so much to promote knowledge of the art and antiquities of this part of Asia, especially M. Coedès. The English contribution has hitherto been very small.

Those of us therefore who have been stirred to admiration by isolated sculptures in this or that museum, and wish to know more of Siamese art and its relation to the other arts of Asia, will be glad to take Dr. le May for guide. It is true that reading this volume is rather like walking through a strange wood by a dim light; but the author has at least blazed a track through the wood, and when we emerge we find we possess a fairly clear conception of the successive phases of Siamese Art and Siamese history. Probably there will be controversy among specialists as to some of Dr. le May's conclusions on particular points; but at any rate he provides a serviceable foundation.

The subject is complicated by the fact that we have to deal not with the art of a single race but of several races; cultural influences have streamed into the country from all sides. And apart from traditions and a few inscriptions there is little to go upon in the determination of dates except the comparative study of the sculptures themselves.

Our author begins with a few images of Indian or Sinhalese origin found on Siamese soil; and from what he tells us it is evident that systematic excavation would bring much enlightenment on the development of Siamese Sculptures. The first period of native art is that of the Môn. The Môn race came from Lower Burma and occupied Central Siam. To what heights this art could rise is seen in the terra-cotta head of Buddha in the Bangkok Museum, reproduced by Dr. le May. The fullness and vitality of the modelling, the sensitiveness, the sense of reality, in this moving fragment are extraordinary. This school, our author thinks, was active from the fifth to the tenth century.

Then comes the period of the Khmer ascendency, which in its turn was overthrown by the Tai or Siamese as they are known in Europe. The Khmer, who built Angkor, were great artists. Their sculpture was inspired both by Buddhism and Hinduism; even in the images of Buddha there is a latent sensuality and a hint of cruelty which recall the Hindu gods as they were sculptured in India. In the Buddhas of Khmer type found in Siam these attributes seem to be softened. Dr. Le May reproduces two Buddha heads in sandstone, one in the Victoria and Albert Museum, the other in his own collection, which are superb of their kind.

The Tai are supposed to have been immigrants from the South of China. Our author finds nothing of Chinese character in their art, and its inspiration is of course wholly Indian. Yet perhaps one may discern a remote affinity with Chinese art in Siamese tendencies in design, with its fondness for flame-like shapes, and its rather abstract character. This may be fanciful;

but one would think that the sculptors, however reverentially following Indian example, would be influenced by the physical type of their own people. In any case, the study of the assimilation and gradual modification of foreign ideals by a gifted race is a fascinating theme. Dr. le May's story is constantly interrupted by discussion of obscure problems and controversy on theories of other writers, so that it is not too easy reading. But this is largely pioneer work, and such drawbacks are inevitable. The author does not treat of Siamese painting, a subject probably still more difficult than the sculpture—but not unworthy of attention.

LAURENCE BINYON

Benjamin Franklin. By CARL VAN DOREN. (The Viking Press, New York. $3.75.)

Benjamin Franklin, who stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries, ranks as one of the greatest men the Western world has produced. He was born in 1706, and, beginning active life at the age of sixteen, played the rôles of a business man, a politician, a scientist, a foreign diplomat and a philosopher, retired from public life at the age of eighty-two and died in his eighty-fourth year. During this long period of intense activity, he worked without a break and his life embraced not only most of the significant events in the development of the America of that century but also many memorable occurrences in the Europe of that day. It included the beginnings of American literature and journalism, the international wars, the Revolution, the Confederation, the shaping of the Constitution, the democratic movement within the States, the expansion of American commerce and industry, science and invention, the extension of agriculture, the development of banking and insurance, the growth of cities, the movement for intercolonial and national unity, the formulation of economic and political theories, relations with American Indians and the development of American philanthropy and education. The enumeration of even all these gives us only a partial list of the major events and developments in which Franklin played so significant a part. His biography is almost a history of the eighteenth century.

It is no wonder, therefore, that though countless special studies had been made and many volumes written on various aspects of Franklin's life and career no author before Carl Van Doren had attempted to write a biography covering in precise detail his long and many-sided life. What he has done, simple in conception but almost overwhelming in execution, has been to set down the complete life as Franklin himself might have written it had he ever completed the famous *Autobiography* which dealt only with his years as a rising tradesman, and did not reach his memorable years as imperial prophet, revolutionary statesman, cosmopolitan diplomat, scientist, wit, moralist, sage. As he became more and more involved in the national life of America, he found little time to carry out the history of himself that he had planned.

And now Mr. Van Doren has completed what Franklin left unfinished. Few are better qualified to write the biography of this great man than the present author who has given much of the last twenty years to writing and research on the life of Franklin and who has long been a dominant figure in the American world of letters.

The chief aim in producing this monumental volume is, the author informs us, "to restore to Franklin, so often remembered piecemeal in this or that of his diverse aspects, his magnificent central unity as a great and wise man moving through great and troubling events". To the extent that it is possible to do this, Mr. Van Doren has done it. His volume is undoubtedly the most comprehensive and the most critically sympathetic biography of Franklin yet produced. But while there was consistency of character in Frank-

lin, there was no unity of purpose. His whole life was opportunistic, and he was urged to activity now by curiosity, now by benevolence, now by duty. This was characteristic of his life throughout. He did things as they came to him.

His mind was a federation of purposes, working harmoniously together. Other philosophers might be dark and profound but Franklin moved serenely through the visible world trying to understand it all.

What Franklin was in his outstanding characteristics that America has come to be. So to the modern American, Franklin is more representative of American traits than Washington, Jefferson or John Adams.

Separated from Franklin by a century and a half, Mr. Van Doren has sought to understand him and his world not only through his own words and his *Autobiography* but also through the thousands of letters, the numerous scattered articles and the volumes of scientific, political and economic treatises written by him or about him. Since the political history of the time and the story of Franklin's activities as a diplomat and a statesman are better known, the author's chief contribution is in his detailed attention to certain aspects of Franklin's personal life, his literary activities and his scientific interests. These are clearly set forth and well integrated with other phases of his career. Mr. Van Doren has vividly reconstructed Franklin's surroundings, the formal society of Boston and Philadelphia, the scientific society of London and the aristocratic society of Paris in which Franklin moved with so much ease. Equally interesting is the portrayal of Franklin in his family relationships and in his friendships with people unknown to fame.

But that is not all. There is an excellent survey of Franklin's early literary efforts and also a thorough review of the various issues of *Poor Richard's Almanac*. In addition, the author provides us with an impressive summary of Franklin's scientific activities—his experiments with electricity, the Franklin stove, the invention of the glass harmonica, his interest in scientific agriculture, the first flexible catheter, his study of whirlwinds and of the Gulf Stream and of canals, his interest in ventilation and in the application of oil to rough seas, and a hundred other similar experiments—as fundamental contributions to the development of science in America.

This lengthy biography does not, however, give one a clear idea of Franklin's philosophy or of his economic and political theory as a system. Perhaps this is due to his solutions to the problems having been spread over a long lifetime and to the fact that Franklin was in himself "a harmonious human multitude". All the same, the book is a signal contribution to biographical literature. It contains much material never before presented to the public and it recreates the exciting epoch in which Franklin lived. Moreover, its value is not merely historical; it has human value as a portrayal of a great man, prepared with great care, subjected to the most rigorous scholarship and written with deep affection for one of history's most lovable and fascinating figures. The publication of this work may well be reckoned as the outstanding event of 1938 in American letters. Among Mr. Van Doren's many important works, this is the one most likely to survive.

J. M. KUMARAPPA

Building the British Empire: To the End of the First Empire. By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. (Scribner's, New York. $3.50)

This is a biography of the Empire. The well-known American author starts his story from the early life of the English lands, swept by repeated alien raids, and suggests that the infusion of foreign blood with varying racial strains may account for the bewildering contradictions in British national character.

He proceeds to set out a parade of personalities and events, stirred to vivid life, and while high-lighting subtle or dramatic moods avoids dull patches of detail. His task is not simply one of selection. "The aim is to discover what the British are like, what made them what they are", and how they spread out to rule a quarter of the earth.

The author, curiously, treats the Empire as a single unit, a sort of Greater Britain—as if the colonies had had no separate, isolated life of their own. The Crown, he tells us, I think incorrectly, "sums up in itself as one symbol the entire strivings, hopes, aspirations and loyalties....of all the peoples of the Empire".

Indian affairs occupy barely fifteen pages of this bulky volume which carries the story down to the independence of the United States. The tendency of British historians to overestimate empire-builders like Warren Hastings is here reproduced. Consider this amazing statement: "In a little over two years Hastings succeeded in giving Bengal the best government any Indian province had ever had." Mr. Adams notes no anomaly in the divergent fates of Clive and Nandakumar, both of whom committed forgery, then punishable according to English law with death. Clive was raised to the peerage; Nandakumar was hanged.

The path of Imperialism is not strewn with the roses of a spotless moral standard. All Empires have been founded and extended by blood and tears. Mr. Adams ignores this fact and follows orthodox British historians who have presented him not only with factual material but also with a point of view. So he does not speak of the ravages of John Company, the terrorist technique employed to destroy India's industries, but refers to the "horrors" of the Black Hole of Calcutta, a doubtful episode probably fabricated by one Company official proved to have been a notorious liar.

Mr. Adams wisely avoids detailing wars in the drum-and-trumpet style. But he falters when he tries to explore economic aspects. He does not interpret the nature of mercantile capitalism, the forerunner of finance capital. Economic motives do not strike him as essential springs of human action. Yet, in the light of events that convulse the world to-day, does it not seem that, in the final analysis, imperialist expansion gets nearly all its steam out of an economic urge?

This book may be recommended to the lay reader for its clear, arresting unfoldment of Britain's history. The specialist will find in it, at any rate, a facility of phrase, a picturesque presentation.

BHABANI BHATTACHARYA

[Those who want to see the picture of history from the side of the Indians will do well to peruse the *Rise of the Christian Power in India* by Major Basu. In that connection we might quote some words of Benjamin Franklin about Imperialistic wars: "Justice is as strictly due between neighbour nations as between neighbour citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when single; and a nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."—EDS.]

Power. By BERTRAND RUSSELL. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 7*s*. 6*d*.)

The theme of the eighteen chapters of this "new social analysis", as it is designated, is that power is the fundamental social science—not power in any one form, economic, military, propaganda, or other—but power in general and relatively considered in its various aspects, and finally the need of the taming of power for human welfare. The work is rich in historical illustrations and the subject is considered psychologically and as related to philosophy and religion, complete with political wisdom. Its publication in these tragic days is timely; it seems to give a clearer analysis of present world conditions, and to show better the way of future development than any book of its kind that we have seen.

If the first chapters be found pedantic, and Russell's personal opinions too withdrawn, in the later ones we are offered a splendid reward for continuing, and we are left in no doubt regarding Russell's views. Although he warns us against eloquence, we are much moved by the words of this great humanitarian.

One of the first points he makes is the mistake of Marx and orthodox economists in taking economic self-interest as the fundamental motive in social science.

We are shown vividly how in this mechanical age the power over matter has lessened human sympathy. He writes :—

> In former days men sold themselves to the Devil to acquire magical power. Nowadays they acquire these powers from science, and find themselves compelled to become devils. There is no hope for the world unless power can be tamed, and brought into the service, not of this or that group of fanatical tyrants, but of the whole of the human race.... If human life is to be for the mass of mankind anything better than a dull misery punctuated with moments of sharp horror, there must be as little naked power as possible.

Of nationalism we read that it is "a stupid ideal, and people perceive that it is bringing Europe to ruin".

Writing of the tendency for organizations to coalesce, he points out that "moral obligations are not confined to a section of the human race". In the chapter on "Power and Moral Codes" he says :—

> All great moralists from Buddha and the Stoics down to recent times, treated the good as something to be, if possible, enjoyed by all men equally....Their Ethic had always a twofold source: on the one hand they valued certain elements in their own lives; on the other hand, sympathy made them desire for others what they desired for themselves....Power is the means, in ethical contests as in those of politics. But with the Ethical systems that have had most influence in the past, power is not the end.....Their founders were men whose sympathy was universal, and who were felt, on this account, to be possessed of a wisdom surpassing that of temporary and passionate despots....I do not think that the return to a tribal or aristocratic ethic can be of long duration; the whole history of man since the time of Buddha points in the opposite direction. However passionately power may be desired, it is not power that is thought good in moments of reflection and meditation. This is proved by the characters of the men whom mankind have thought most divine.

Under "The Ethics of Power", he continues :—

> "If I had to select four men who had more power than any others, I should mention Buddha and Christ, Pythagoras and Galileo. No one of the four had the support of the State until after his propaganda had achieved a great measure of success. No one of the four had much success in his own lifetime. No one of the four would have affected human life as he has done if power had been his *primary* object. No one of the four sought the kind of power that enslaves others, but the kind that sets them free—in the case of the first two, by showing how to master the desires that lead to strife, and thence to defeat slavery and subjection; in the case of the second two, by pointing the way towards the control of natural forces. *It is not ultimately by violence that men are ruled, but by the wisdom of those who appeal to the common desires of mankind, for happiness, for inward and outward peace, and for the understanding of the world.*

Under "The Taming of Power" he says :—

> "The organized life of the community is necessary, but it is necessary as mechanism, not something to be valued on its own account. What is of most value in human life is more analogous to what all the great religious teachers have spoken of."

E. H. BREWSTER

Kant's Pre-Critical Ethics. By PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP (Studies in the Humanities No. 2, Northwestern University, Evanston and Chicago. $2.50)

The traditional view of Kant as a moral philosopher is that he was an uncompromising rationalist and rigorist. In his anxiety to uphold the categorical nature of the Ought, he wholly excluded feeling therefrom, thus depriving it of all content. The difficulties of his language and the complicated and unsystematic way in which he wrote have made almost impossible a proper understanding of his doctrines whether as metaphysician or as moralist. Of late, however, attempts have been made to arrive at more sympathetic and correct evaluations. Notable in recent years is Professor Paton's work on *Kant's Metaphysic of Experience.* At least as important to a better study of the *Critiques* is the study of what Kant wrote in the long years prior to these—essays, dissertations, letters, lecture-notes, etc. An examination of these will reveal the developing Kant and help to clarify his developed thought. Such an attempt was made in the case of Kant's Ethics by Paul Menzer in the second and third volumes of *Kant-Studien* ; in spite, however, of his " great care and painstaking analysis ", he failed to appreciate duly much that was significant in the earlier writings, with the result that the current misconceptions about Kant were left standing.

The present work of Mr. Schilpp is a far more sympathetic study, notable for its clear analysis, ample documentation, and cogent presentation. We are shown how Kant was neither melancholic nor pessimistic ; how he recognised the place of feelings and helpful drives in the moral life ; how though appreciating the moral sense school, he never wholly adopted their doctrines or those of Rousseau ; how his subsequent condemnation of these was not a sudden inexplicable revolt, but an explication of a critical attitude present from the first ; how when he stresses the rôle of reason, he views it not as an empty deductive principle, but as a regulative inductive principle—and so on. Unlike the majority of works on Kant, the book before us makes fascinating reading and presents Kant himself as a very lovable figure. But Mr. Schilpp is not blind to the defective trends in Kant's thought. The present volume is confined to the pre-critical Ethics. The author is convinced that an analysis of the later writings will tend only to confirm his conclusions, though he has necessarily to postpone this attempt.

The Indian reader has always noticed parallels between Kant as traditionally presented and certain aspects of Hindu Ethics, notably the teaching of the *Bhagavad Gītā,* exhorting to duty in scorn of consequence. While in its anti-utilitarian teaching it reveals much in common with Kant, it has been thought that in doctrines like dedication to God and so on, the *Gīta* shows superiority over the mere rigorism of Kantian ethics. When the latter misconception about Kant is dispelled, the former claim will have to be revised. Even as it is, the Hindu apologist is hard put to it to answer the question how far the *Gītā* avoids the formalism imputed to Kant. What guidance does it give in answering concrete ethical problems as to what A, B or C should do ? One seems compelled to offer the code of *varṇāshrama dharma* as a comprehensive answer to such questions. If that is the only answer, Kant seems to be a better moralist, in holding that morality is dynamic and that " the moral law is holy not because it has been revealed to us. Its holiness is original and our own reason is capable of revealing it to us."

Another parallel to Kant is provided by Prābhākara who held that the Vedic injunctions are obligatory because they are spiritual not because of pleasurable consequences promised. A man is to offer sacrifice because he is enjoined to, not because he is promised heaven. Even such a rigoristic notion of the " Ought " could not ignore consequence utterly. Though heaven did not enter into the imperative, an unseen result (*apūrva*) of the present act, contributory to future heavenly enjoyment, consti-

tutes a "helpful drive" (*niyoga*) to the action enjoined. The doctrine of *niyoga* seems to provide even a closer link with Kant as his teaching is now presented to us. The Prābhākara system is little understood and much criticised, sharing in a large measure the same fate as Kant's ; its rival, the *Bhāṭṭa* school, with its frank exploitation of the category of end-and-means has made a more successful appeal both to the vulgar and to the learned. A re-valuation of ethical ideals is necessary in this country ; and in the process, a better understanding of Kant will prove of immense benefit. As a contribution to this the volume deserves a very cordial welcome.

S. S. SURYANARAYANA SHASTRI

The Indwelling God : Historical Study of the Christian Conception of Divine Immanence and Incarnation with Special Reference to Indian Thought. By E. C. DEWICK, M.A. (Oxford University Press. Rs. 7)

At a time like the present when economic and political problems claim the monopoly of the energies of mankind, it is refreshing to come across a volume devoted to a discussion of the problem of Divine In-Dwelling which demonstrates that even amidst the clash and clamour of contemporary civilization, there are thinkers interested in the pursuit of eternal verities. Presented to Cambridge University as a thesis for the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity in 1936, the volume under notice reveals the author's industrious quest along the pathway to Reality. The seventh chapter is devoted to an exposition of the Christian teaching about Immanence. The vicissitudes of the doctrine in Roman Catholic Christianity and in the Reformed Churches, the revival of and the reaction against Immanentism in the post-war period, are all narrated with insight and precision. General conclusions are drawn in the fourteenth chapter. The fifteenth and concluding chapter refers to certain unsolved problems of Divine Immanence.

Mr. Dewick briefly surveys Indian conceptions of Divine Immanence in the *Gita*, the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*, and examines the later development of the doctrine.

It is not difficult to agree with the author in his main conclusions. Thoroughgoing Immanentism, and thoroughgoing Transcendentalism are to be avoided as undesirable and unprofitable extremes. There is the middle path. In understanding the relation between God in man on the one hand, and God in nature on the other, some Immanence and some Transcendence are inevitable. But while the wisdom of the Middle Path is obvious it is not easy to translate its theoretical doctrinal elements into ethical conduct. Mr. Dewick's treatment of Indian Philosophy reveals but imperfect acquaintance with doctrines, details and historical evolution. He refers to certain well-known works by Indian and European writers on Indian Philosophy, but that is just the reason why he has been misled. I shall cite only three instances : (1) It is not correct to state that in the Upanishads the emphasis falls more on Immanence than Transcendence. The problem cannot be narrowed down or restricted to emphasis. The whole of the *Katha Upanishad* teaches Divine Transcendence. There are countless other texts as well. (2) His view that in the *Gita* logical inconsistencies are even more evident than in the *Upanishads* is not correct. The *Gita* is definitely designed to remove logical inconsistencies. (3) His view of Madhva of Udipi is wrong. It needs immediate and thorough overhauling. I do not blame Mr. Dewick for special pleading here and there in behalf of Christianity but I suggest that the Middle Path has been carved out by followers of other religions who were experts in spiritual engineering. Mr. Dewick's study of Divine Immanence is refreshing, resonant with vibrations of reason and faith, and it must wake at least some from spiritual slumber.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA

The Voluntary Citizen : An Enquiry into the Place of Philanthropy in the Community. By CONSTANCE BRAITHWAITE. (Methuen, London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

One way in which the strongly marked individualism of the British people has been humanised through the centuries is shown by the history of philanthropy in England. This book may be described as a tribute to this spirit, as it is a survey of philanthropic activities inspired by the desire to relieve man's estate. The title is happily conceived, as it loads the term " citizen " with a meaning which is uncapturable by any Acts of Parliament.

The author approaches the problem in a spirit of scientific detachment and passes in review voluntary activities in every sphere of life, though she confesses her personal predilections as a socialist. Her main thesis is that even in the best ordered society there is bound to be scope for voluntary effort undertaken by the more fortunate citizens in the interests of the backward majority.

The first section of the book, in some ways the most important, is devoted to the motives behind all kinds of philanthropy ; the author shows the interrelationship that must always exist between official and non-official effort. She gives interesting examples of action by the state inspired by private zeal, sometimes parallel with it, less rarely inspiring it.

Even in philanthropy there is a controversial field, as can easily be imagined with the multiplicity of ideologies and the overflow of missionary zeal to propagate them. It is undesirable for the state to enter this field, although in authoritarian states the experiment seems to be succeeding : but the cost of such an unnatural suppression of the most spontaneous impulse in human nature will be found in the long run unduly great. This reflection supports the author's remark that the " voluntary citizen " thrives only in democratic states.

The second and third sections are largely statistical, and must have involved tremendous labour in the compiling, since the data are available, we believe, only in out-of-the-way corners of the book-world.

The volume is bound to prove a standard of reference to the history and resources of all charitable organisations in Britain, with their spheres of influence extending from the most obscure parish to matters of international concern, such as are dealt with by the International Labour Office at Geneva.

P. M.

Bradley and Bergson. By RAM MURTI LOOMBA. (The Upper India Publishing House Ltd., Lucknow. Rs. 2-8)

Philosophical research, unlike scientific research, consists in re-thinking old problems, re-viewing old systems in new perspectives and discovering similarities between doctrines so far deemed different. Mr. Loomba sets to himself the task of comparing the philosophical systems of Bradley and Bergson. Bradley, after successively putting to the touchstone of self-consistency the various categories of experience such as causality, space, time, relation and even self, finds them internally rent asunder by inconsistency and discord and hence relegates them all to the world of " appearance " and then seeks " reality " in an Absolute which, in a sense, transcends all these categories. Bergson, on the other hand, discarding logical analysis, takes intuition to be the sole means of apprehending the Absolute, which is infinite because it is simple. The Absolute of Bergson seems to be concrete and immanent and not abstract and transcendent like that of Bradley. In spite of this divergence between the two systems, our author seeks to establish that Bradley and Bergson agree in basic tendencies of thought and so ultimately arrive at the same conclusion as regards the essential nature of Reality. It is significant that Mr. Loomba takes the help of Indian Philosophy to bracket Bradley and Bergson together. He contends that it is on the vantage-ground of the basic " vision " of immediate experience, which is

direct, non-relational and intuitive, that Bradley and Bergson meet ; this is the mysticism to be met with in both. This book presents an original point of view.

D. S. LONDHE

Civilisation : The Next Step. By C. DELISLE BURNS. (Nicholson and Watson, London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Delisle Burns's latest book is a significant contribution to an understanding of present-day problems. It is not a political book but a partly psychological and partly ethical interpretation of the basis of civilisation to-day, explaining how deficiencies in our social behaviour and moral codes lead ultimately to instability in national life with inevitable political repercussions. It is necessary if civilization is to progress that the ordinary man should understand what he can do to serve this end and how, by conforming to a certain pattern of social behaviour he can help to eliminate all those undesirable facets of civilisation which directly or indirectly cause distress and unhappiness.

One of the book's chief merits is this focussing of responsibility for the next step primarily on the individual. Civilisation is defined as " a way of living ", dependent to be sure upon economic and political factors up to a certain point, but " seen best in the manners and customs of ordinary intercourse in normal daily life ". The " next step " indicated for the individual is in the direction of the abolition of snobbery, social, racial, national and economic, and of " a friendliness which can subordinate to itself differences of sex, age, occupation or political and religious opinions ". Civilisation must perish ultimately if it is not based fundamentally on an all-embracing friendliness, but it is doubtful whether that precise degree of friendliness is possible as long as the present disparity in economic conditions remains. Mr. Burns is not primarily concerned with the standards of living but with the standards of conduct which have evolved in the last fifty years, but is he possibly overstressing abstract virtues when he says that " if anyone wants to reform the world, he must begin with an improvement of his own manners "?

He has made a broad survey of the new attitude towards women, of the treatment of children, of the new conception of manual workers, and of peace as a system of government and a new form of life. His arraignment of war is masterly. He considers the position which he ascribes to some Western pacifists, that " no resistance ought to be offered to intolerance or oppression ", but condemns it as " not practical politics ".

Civilisation cannot progress unless the new standards which Mr. Burns mentions, as well as the older ones, are adequately understood by ordinary people in their correct perspective, because it is only then that we shall have a glimpse into the real problems of civilisation and be able to assess their importance by a fundamental sense of values rather than by our present-day taboo-ridden standards.

It is not necessary to agree with Mr. Burns's stand on all details. It is possible to dissent radically on certain points, as on the controversial issue of birth-control, and yet to appreciate the soundness and the practical nature of most of his conclusions. He strikes a wholesome note in his stress of moral values and his final conclusion that " the next step must be such as to make more widespread and powerful the feeling for justice ". Mr. Burns brushes aside " wise sayings or traditional proverbs " as " the basis for ethical teaching " but would not the popularizing and the grasping of the following statement by the ancient Indian lawgiver further the last-mentioned objective? Say *The Laws of Manu* (VIII. 15)

> Justice, being violated, destroys ; justice, being preserved, preserves ; therefore justice must not be violated, lest violated justice destroy us.

E. K.

CORRESPONDENCE

"IT WOULD BE A PITY, IF ..."

One purpose of THE ARYAN PATH is admirably served by the September issue —the making known to the West of an Indian philosophy of life, and, to the East, of the reactions of a few Western writers to Mr. Gandhi's views. It would be a pity, however, if misunderstanding should arise because of an erroneous identification of Mr. Gandhi's theories and practices (political and other) with the teachings of the Esoteric Philosophy associated with the name of H. P. Blavatsky, who was inflexible in her rule never to enter the arena of Anglo-Indian politics, however they were disguised. It may be asked, what has all this to do with Swaraj, as conceived by Mr. Gandhi? Unfortunately, we cannot dissociate Mr. Gandhi's philosophy of life from his political activities, which have been many and various and, occasionally, disastrous, as he has always been the first to admit. That being so, it is most necessary to emphasise the fact that Theosophy, as such, takes its stand upon the duty of directing the formation of public opinion "by inculcating those higher and nobler conceptions of public and private duties which lie at the root of all spiritual and material improvement." (*The Key to Theosophy.*)

This reform in human nature can be effected only by an understanding of the fundamental principles of the Secret Doctrine, which imply the exclusion of no one from the operation of Brotherhood, and are most decidedly non-sectarian and impartial as factors in our judgment of human affairs. Mental and emotional slavery is to be condemned equally with blind violence as being conducive to an unjust and despotic authority. India (like the West at least in this respect) has ever been prone to rely upon "spiritual" authority and to watch for an external saviour. Long ago, it was pointed out by one of Mme. Blavatsky's Instructors that "the present tendency of education is to make them (the people of India) materialistic and root out spirituality", and that "with a proper understanding of what their ancestors meant by their writings and teachings, education would become a blessing, whereas now it is often a curse". The task before the student of Theosophy in India, as elsewhere, remains what it has been throughout the history of the Theosophical Movement, namely, to "help to furnish the materials for a needed universal religious philosophy; one impregnable to scientific assault, because itself the finality of absolute science, and a religion that is indeed worthy of the name since it includes the relations of man physical to man psychical, and of the two to all that is above and below them."

London. B. P. HOWELL

A CORRECTION

On page 37 of THE ARYAN PATH for January 1939 you have inadvertently left a reader open to the impression that the sentence which you quote from me expresses my judgment.

In the article in *Time & Tide* from which your quotation is drawn, I go on in the next issue to say: "But for one thing my mind would feel constrained to accept the logic of pacifism."

Oxford MICHAEL E. SADLER

ENDS AND SAYINGS

In this number of THE ARYAN PATH our contributors have spread a fare which ought to go a great way toward helping those who wish to nourish the world. There is little doubt left in thinking minds of the failure of familiar methods of averting war or sustaining order in times of peace. The views of India's great leader are drawing increasing attention to themselves. But between theory and practice there is an abyss which needs to be speedily bridged if the doctrines of Satyagraha are to save our humanity. Almost without exception every one acknowledges the might and the nobility of the principles implicit in the philosophy of Non-violence; but there are many who have little faith in human nature and who therefore regard those principles as impracticable for the world of to-day. There is a basis for holding this view, inasmuch as in so many parts of the world violence has been organised and is actually at work. What can Spain or China do when violent enemies are active within their geographical boundaries? Almost nothing. There it remains only for individuals to develop a non-violent mind by self-purification, and to suffer the pain and the humiliation of heart which will yield the strength of soul that can protect a whole neighbourhood. But this faith is difficult for people brought up in materialistic concepts of life, of evolution and of the Universe.

There are, however, territories where it is still possible for people to study and to reflect upon the philosophy of Satyagraha, and to prepare themselves and their co-citizens to use it to stem the oncoming tide which must envelope the whole of Europe in a *terreur*.

Especially here in India national Karma has brought us a superb opportunity, for in our midst not only lives and sets an example, but also labours assiduously to teach others, one who has mastered the technique of Non-violence or Satyagraha. Gandhiji both propounds and exemplifies his philosophy, which is as noble in ideas as it is practical, as potent for uplifting the morals of the individual as it is practicable for exercising the highest forms of altruism. Thousands of Indians are foregoing the advantage which Gandhiji's presence and instruction offer; all revere him and touch his feet, but how many revere him sufficiently to offer their minds purified by his instruction and their hearts inspired by his example? Not ignorance but false knowledge holds them back to their own detriment and, worse, to the detriment of the Motherland and therefore of the world.